

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the DEAN OF WINCHESTER, THE DEANERY, WINCHESTER, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XXII

MARCH, 1931

No. 129

EDITORIAL

WE have received, and shall hope shortly to review, a copy of Professor A. E. Taylor's Gifford Lectures, entitled *The Faith of a Moralist*;* but meanwhile we desire without delay to commend them very warmly to readers of THEOLOGY. We have read no book in the last ten years which has impressed us more by the range and profundity of its thought, the fervour of its enthusiasm for truth and righteousness, and the force of its exposition and defence of the Christian Faith. The lover of Plato will find the essence of his teaching here distilled and christened by the greatest of living Platonists. Those who have been distressed at the spread of hedonism and other forms of secularist ethics in recent years will find these movements—in appearance so modern, but in reality so ancient—exposed to a devastating criticism by one who has a quite exceptional insight into the true condition of the human heart. Disciples of von Hügel will find his rich and mature apologetic taken up into a philosophy which, losing nothing in depth, represents a wider and more liberal Catholicism. This is a book not to borrow but at all costs to buy, and to place on the shelf where it can be referred to at any moment. Such moments of reference will be a "retreat for the soul" and an illumination for the mind.

The death of Dr. Charles robs the Church of England of one of its few scholars of world-wide reputation. His great work was done in the field of Jewish eschatology and apocrypha, and it was the work of a pioneer; its importance lies in the fact that he brought a whole world of new *data* into the study of Jewish early Christian thought. He would have readily admitted that his handling of these *data* would probably need much revision as time went on; and in many ways, as in his book *The Resurrection of the Dead*, which we shall hope to review next month, his excursions from his own specialized studies into more general theology were not very happy. But he leaves to all who knew him the memory of an eye that flashed with zeal for truth, a hand that laboured indefatigably, and a heart that was fundamentally kind.

* Macmillan and Co., 1930, 2 vols., 15s. each vol.

THE CONFLICT OF JESUS WITH THE UNCLEAN SPIRITS *

THE Synoptic Gospels show Jesus to us not only as prophet, miracle worker, and teacher, but also as exorcist. In the earliest tradition the exorcisms play a great part,† but the attention paid to them by modern exegesis stands in no reasonable relation to the importance which the Primitive Church assigned to this side of Jesus' activity. True, the tradition on this point has never been seriously questioned; but it has been usual to treat the exorcisms of Jesus with a certain superiority, as a *zeitgeschichtlich* feature, as a form of superstition which Jesus shared with his time and which had no special importance for his conception of the task that confronted him.‡

Modern scholarship is, however, characterized by a growing realism in regard to the history and teaching of Jesus, and his conflict with the unclean spirits has now begun to receive more serious consideration. It now appears that behind the exorcisms we may apprehend a deeper perspective; Jesus himself assigned to them a significance going far beyond the merely accidental, discerning in the background the mystery of spiritual evil; and the recognition of this fact can lead us towards a truer idea of his interpretation of his own mission.

I

First, then, let us notice the position of *demoniacal possession* and *exorcism* in Judaism at the time of Jesus. We have ample evidence; we know from Jewish sources that possession was a widespread phenomenon in Palestine at this time, and, consequently, that exorcism was a well-known practice.§ This fact emerges also in the New Testament. We have the retort of

* This article originally appeared in the *Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift*, Häfte 4, 1930. Translation by Dr. Hugo Odeberg, Upsala.

† Exorcism is absent from the Fourth Gospel. The reason for this will be suggested further down.

‡ G. Naumann, *Die Wertschätzung des Wunders im N.T.*, 1903; H. Monnier, *La mission historique de Jésus*, Paris, 1906; F. Barth, *Die Hauptprobleme des Lebens Jesu*, 3 ed., 1907; R. A. Hoffmann, *Die Erlösergedanken des geschichtlichen Christus*, Königsberg, 1911. A more realistic view in M. Dibelius' *Geschichtliche und übergeschichtliche Religion*, 1925, p. 39 ff.

§ Josephus, *Antt.*, viii. 2, 5; L. Blau, *Das altjüdische Zauberwesen*, 2 ed., 1914; Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum N.T. aus Talmud und Midrasch*, iv. 1, München, 1928, pp. 501-535, *Exkurs 21: Zur altjüdischen Dämonologie*; Taufik Canaan, *Dämonenglaube im Lande der Bibel*, Leipzig, 1929 (*Das Morgenland*, H. 21); M. Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 1901, p. 119 ff.; I. Scheftelowitz, *Altpalästinischer Bauernglaube*, 1925; A. Kohut, *Angelologie und Dämonologie in ihrer Abhängigkeit vom Parsismus*, 1896; S. Daiches, *Babylonian Magic in the Talmud and in the Later Jewish Literature*, London, 1913; R. C. Thompson, *Semitic Magic, Its Origin and Development*, London, 1908; Otto Weber, *Dämonenbeschwörungen bei den Babyloniern und Assyriern*. *Der alte Orient*, VII., 4, Leipzig, 1904.

Jesus to his accusers: "If I by Beelzebul cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out?" (Matt. xii. 27); the narrative of the man who drove out demons by the name of Jesus, but did not belong to the circle of disciples (Mark ix. 38 ff.); and the mention in Acts of "vagabond Jews, exorcists," among whom were the seven sons of Sceva the chief priest (xix. 13 ff.). Lastly we find that, in this not very attractive field, Judaism made an important contribution to Hellenistic syncretism; Hellenistic magic abounds with Jewish magical formulæ and names—e.g., Iao, Sabaoth, Adonai, Abraham, names of angels, and, above all, Solomon, the supreme conjurer of spirits.* The extraordinary frequency of Jewish magical names can only be explained on the assumption that the Jews were the great specialists in exorcistic practice.

Possession and exorcism, then, certainly came within the range of Jesus' experience and reflection; and when a series of the earliest and most original Synoptic narratives tell how he himself exorcised the possessed, this tradition suits the *milieu* very well.† The problem is simply to define the place of these episodes within the ministry of Jesus.‡ From the tradition one gets the impression that such occasions as a rule, at least in the early period of his ministry, came to him as unforeseen and startling experiences: he enters a synagogue, and immediately there is a possessed man who begins to utter loud cries. How are we to picture the inner causality in these cases? One might point to the sensitiveness of persons with unbalanced or abnormal minds for unusual mental states in others;§ and

* Origen, c. *Cels.* IV., 33, Hippolyt. *Philos.* IV., 28, p. 547 f. See Chester MacCown, *The Testament of Solomon*, Leipzig, 1922 (*Untersuchungen zum N.T.* herausgeg. von H. Windisch, 9). Rich material and literature in *Papyri Osloenses*, I., *Magical Papyri*, ed. S. Eitrem, Oslo, 1925; cf. *Ein christliches Amulett auf Papyrus*, von S. Eitrem; A. Fridrichsen, Oslo, 1921 (*Videnskapsselskapets forhandlinger*, 1921, 1), p. 9 ff.; F. Pfister, Art. *Epode* in *Pauly—Wissowa—Kroll's Realencyklopädie Suppl.*, Bd. IV., 323 ff.; C. Wessely, *Ephesia grammata*, Wien, 1886 (*Jahresber. des Franz-Josephs-Gymnasiums*); *Griechische Zauberpapyri von Paris und London*, Wien, 1888 (*Denkschriften der k. Akad. d. Wiss.*).

† The part played by exorcism in primitive Christianity points in the same direction.

‡ The mighty deeds of Jesus, especially the exorcisms, cannot possibly have been narrated merely in order to demonstrate the superiority of Jesus over the Baptist. Jesus' exorcisms gave his opponents reason for many dark accusations, which the Church for a long time had trouble to reject; this may have been one of the reasons why Jesus' exorcisms are not mentioned in the Fourth Gospel. The Baptist dwelt in the wilderness, and hence did not come in contact with the mass of the people; Jesus, on the contrary, was going round visiting towns and villages, and therefore of necessity was brought up against disease and possession continually.

§ Vide J. Tambornino, *De antiquorum dæmonismo*, Giessen, 1909; J. Smit, *De dæmoniacis in historia evangelica*, Rome, 1913; Th. Taczsak, *Dämonische Besessenheit*, Münster i. W. 1903; A. Titius, *Heilung von Dämonischen im N.T.* in *Festschrift für Bonwetsch*, Leipzig, 1918; K. Oesterreich, *Die Besessenheit*, Langensalza, 1921; E. R. Micklem, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, Oxford, 1922; H. Rust, *Die Wunder der Bibel*, I., 1922, II., 1923, Pfullingen in Württemberg; A. von Harnack, *Mission und Ausbreitung*, 4th. ed., 1924, I., 152.

if Jesus was generally known as a powerful teacher and miraculous healer—Galilee is small and rumour spreads fast—it is not strange that the atmosphere surrounding Jesus, the emotional wave following him wherever he went, should call forth a spontaneous reaction on the part of the possessed.

As regards the further interpretation of the narratives in question, it might be noted that they are, of course, modelled in a typical literary style. They are not mere reports of actual happenings—we must read them with a critical discernment of the elements of the tradition, and try to discover the type of material and the popular literary style which underlie them and have contributed to their formation.* The sudden, startling element belongs to the style of such anecdotes; but in this case, this feature is undoubtedly founded on reality. The same holds true of the loud cries accompanying the fits of the possessed.

But these cries are, in one part of the gospel tradition, not inarticulate; they contain a passionate address to the exorcist: "What hast thou to do with us, thou Jesus of Nazareth? Art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God" (Mark i. 24). How are we to interpret these words of the demon, which cause Jesus to utter a severe and effective command of silence: "Be silent, and come out of him" (Mark i. 25)? Can we draw any conclusions with regard to the relation of Jesus to the possessed?

This problem has recently been treated at length by Otto Bauernfeind in his work *Die Worte der Dämonen im Markus-evangelium*.† Bauernfeind's thesis is that the cries of the possessed at the approach of Jesus are an effort to drive away the exorcist by starting a counter-attack; an act of self-defence on the part of the demon. He founds this interesting view on material mainly drawn from Hellenistic magical formulæ, which may, however, be traced also in other sources. He takes as his starting-point the accusations against Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, of being possessed (John vii. 20, viii. 48, 52) and of being a Samaritan (i.e., a pseudo-prophet, viii. 48). These accusations have in view the self-testimony of Jesus, which is taken to be on a par with the usual pseudo-prophetic-demoniacal dicta of the type "I am N. N." (God, the Power, Servant Spirit of God, etc.). This view is rejected in x. 21: "These are not the words of one that hath a devil." There was a definite type of demoniacal language, which appears indirectly

* M. Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, 1919, 36 ff.; R. Bultmann, *Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, 1921, 129 ff.

† Stuttgart, 1927, W. Kohlhammer (*Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament*, herausgeg. von R. Kittel, III., 8).

also in other Jewish literature—e.g., Philo, *Quod Deus sit immutabilis*, § 138 (man's *dianoia* says to the Divine *Logos*: "O, man of God! art thou come to me to call to remembrance my iniquity and my sin?" Cf. 1 Kings xvii. 18). In Hellenistic magic we often find the exclamation: "I know thee! I know who thou art, N. N." This exclamation had a magical sound, and it served to obtain power over the spirit in question. The same applies to the exclamation: "Thou art N. N.!" Consequently, the demon who feels himself imperilled by the presence of the exorcist, tries to defend himself by a conjuring formula. But Jesus at once breaks his power by his command: "Be silent!" Bauernfeind, however, uses a very strange process of reasoning, to show that this, the demons' address to Jesus, is not a typification in the tradition, but actually corresponds to what happened at times at the exorcisms of Jesus (p. 94).

However interesting and valuable, from the point of view of comparative religion, the materials and conclusions of Bauernfeind may be, I do not think that his interpretation is valid. I still maintain the view that I have set forth more fully in my work *Le problème du miracle dans le Christianisme primitif* (Paris, 1925, p. 77), that in these exclamations we have to see a confession attributed to the demon and intended to defend Jesus from the accusation of being in alliance with Beelzebub: in his extreme need the demon testifies that he is standing face to face with "the Holy One of God," with the Messiah. Bauernfeind's demonstration that the demoniacal utterances take their form from the conjuration formulas retains its value also from this apologetic point of view. With regard, then, to the actual historical facts, we get no more than certain principal features of these episodes—viz., the sudden cries of the possessed at the approach of the renowned miracle-worker, and then the command of Jesus: "Be silent, and come out of him!"

But we may, with complete certainty, assume that for Jesus himself the meeting with the demoniacs and the experience of his power over the unclean spirits must have been of great import. His other "mighty works," the healings, had always formed part of the endowments of a prophet, as direct manifestations of a power given by God. The power of exorcism was different. This was, in its very essence, closely associated with magical arts, and those who practised such arts were on the whole suspect, and enjoyed a dubious renown. When Jesus noticed this power in himself, he must have interpreted it from his own personal position and assigned a peculiar importance to his experiences in this field. He must have regarded his power over the unclean spirits as an important element in his proclamation of the nearness of the Kingdom of God:

"If I, by the Spirit of God, cast out devils, then the Kingdom of God is come upon you" (Matt. xii. 28). But we possess direct evidence that he viewed his exorcisms in a wider connection; indeed, they became of essential importance for his interpretation of the situation. A distinct indication of this is to be found in the narrative that tells how Jesus had to defend himself against the accusation of being, as exorcist, allied with the demons with which he was apparently in combat.

II

In Mark iii. 22 it is narrated that the Scribes, who had come down from Jerusalem, said that he (Jesus) was possessed by Beelzebul and that it was by the aid of the prince of evil spirits that he cast out the demons. To this accusation, which, clearly, his opponents spread abroad wherever they went, Jesus gave answer (after "calling them unto him"—here the situation is plainly literary), in the well-known words about Satan driving out Satan, and the kingdom that, having fallen into internal war, is doomed to destruction.

I have elsewhere pointed to the strangeness of the accusation here brought against Jesus: with demonic help he casts out demons! I then considered as most probable that in the Christian tradition the accusation had been intentionally put in such a form as to make its absurdity immediately evident.* With this Bauernfeind, rightly, joins issue, suggesting that there might be here an idea of a "collusion" on the part of the demons: the one feigns casting out the other in order to inspire the onlookers with confidence in an exorcist who in reality is doing the demons' work: thus it is all no more than demonic humbug. And in this direction we have probably to see the correct interpretation. That a conjurer used his power over stronger spirits to drive out weaker ones, is a well-known idea in ancient magic. Here, however, it is said that Jesus is *possessed* by Beelzebul and expels evil spirits by his aid;† in this case, therefore, the principal demon is the master of Jesus and not his servant; Beelzebul's intention in driving out the lower demons must be to strengthen Jesus' renown as an exorcist, and create belief in him as the master over the demons, while in reality he is their passive and obedient tool.

Behind this idea lies the pluralism of popular demonology. The demons, it is true, form together a kingdom, a body of affiliated beings, divided into groups and classes with varying power and faculties; but there is no unity of will in this kingdom,

* *Nachwort zu S. Eitrem: Die Versuchung Christi*, 1924, p. 33.

† Without doubt "Beelzebul," Mark iii. 22, is identical with "the Prince of the evil spirits."

nothing but planlessness, capriciousness, independent activity. It is the grotesque manifold of popular phantasy.

But the answer of Jesus: "How can Satan drive out Satan?" reveals a different and a deeper view. Jesus does not consider the demons as more or less free and independent beings, but as *the servants of Satan*: it is his will they further, his commissions they perform. Therefore he did not regard his conflicts with the unclean spirits as isolated events according to the technical point of view of the exorcist, but as single battles in the campaign against the prince of this world.* Satan, God's great enemy of old, hereby received an actuality which he did not possess in popular belief, where the Devil, like God, was a remote cosmic power, active principally in the oppressing empires and in the heathen cults. For Jesus he was "The Strong One" and the human world was his "house." Jesus actualized Satan, just as he actualized God. Just as he treated with full earnest the coming Divine Kingdom, so he treated also the present dominion of Satan. Jesus radicalized the concepts of religion on this as on all other points. The present situation, as a whole, bore for him a demonic aspect: the advent of the Divine Kingdom first and foremost signified that the prince of this world would be dethroned, fettered, and imprisoned. Therefore in each act of exorcism Jesus saw a defeat of Satan, a presage of the final triumph that was soon to come to pass.

III

It is now necessary to focus attention more closely on Jesus' view—the demonic aspect, the facts of the situation. He had a strong sense of the presence of a superhuman, evil power, hostile to God, with enormous resources, in continual warfare with him, and determined to work his destruction. Traces of this consciousness are to be found all through the gospel tradition. The narrative of the *temptation* at the opening of his Messianic activity strikes this note. Even if, as is probable, we have here a primitive Christian "myth" not directly connected with a historical event, it is, in any case, in keeping with Jesus' own judgment of the situation. Typical for the view found here—a view that certainly was Jesus' own—are Satan's words when from the high mountain he shows Jesus all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them: "All this will I give thee . . ." (Matt. iv. 9). St. Luke adds in the same spirit: "For that is delivered unto me, and to whomso-

* In the Fourth Gospel all demonism is condensed in the "Darkness," the "World"; there is here a thorough-going monism with regard to the activities of evil. This might be the main reason why all exorcisms have been removed in the Johannine redaction of the tradition.

ever I will I give it" (Luke iv. 6). The simile of the *birds* that pick up the seed sown on the wayside (Mark iv. 4) is interpreted as referring to Satan, coming and taking away the word sown in men (iv. 15). The interpretation of the parable is secondary; but it is illustrative of Jesus' own view of the restless activity of his great adversary. The parable of the *Tares among the Wheat* (Matt. xiii. 24-30) gives expression to a vivid consciousness of Satan's unrelenting enmity against the Divine Kingdom. In this case, also, the interpretation (xiii. 36-43) is probably of later origin than the parable itself, and the studied allegorical exposition of the details of the narrative (the Son of Man sows the seed, the enemy is the Devil, etc.) is a result of its homiletical use in the primitive Christian preaching. But even apart from this, reading the narrative of the parable by itself,* one must admit that it implies the reality of a mysterious demonic power, active in the "tares."

From this point of view a surprising light is cast upon the otherwise difficult text (Mt. xi. 12): "From the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and violent ones take it by force." If these *βιασται* are taken to mean, not *men* but *spiritual powers*,† the meaning at once becomes simple and natural. The Baptist's appearance had been a presage for Satan's kingdom of the approach of the final day of reckoning: and it had been the signal for a feverish activity of the hosts of powerful and brutal assailants,‡ with the object of "taking the kingdom of heaven by force"—i.e., of destroying the results of the preaching of the Baptist and of Jesus, and getting mankind in their power.§

Again, Jesus could only explain the spiritual unresponsiveness with which he met as a blindness caused by demonic agencies, which sought to paralyze men's power of understanding, so that even the most evident truths made no impression upon them, and even hardened them yet more. In this Jesus saw the efforts of his formidable adversary summoning all his helpers to maintain and strengthen his hold over the chosen people, and to prevent them from obeying the call to repentance and preparing themselves to receive the Divine Kingdom. But how did he judge the situation in detail?

In his defence against the accusation of being allied with Beelzebul, Jesus says (Mark iii. 27): "No one can enter into the house of the Strong One and spoil his goods, except he first

* Vide R. Bultmann, *Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, 1921, p. 110.

† Vide M. Dibelius, *Geschichtliche und übergeschichtliche Religion*, 1925, p. 39.

‡ If the *βιασται* are demonic powers, then the term recalls the name of a special class of demons: *pega'im* ("assailants"). Vide Billerbeck, iv. 1, 501.

§ ἀπράξιν, of demonic activity directed against the disciples of Jesus, John x. 28 f.

bind the Strong One." This is a general statement put forward as an argument in a particular situation; but the application lies so near at hand that undoubtedly it has moulded the simile and the form of expression.* Hence we may say that we meet here with a conviction in Jesus' mind that he was stronger than Satan; a conviction which seems not to have been founded exclusively on the experience of the exorcisms, but presupposes rather some experience which had signified a decisive victory over Satan himself. What this experience may have been we do not know. It is possible that the account of the temptation is a mythical echo of allusions which Jesus may have made to the experience in question. It would not be far-fetched to note also in this connection the saying: "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven" (Luke x. 18).

But this defeat had not broken Satan's power over men. The judgment on him was indeed decreed; and against the Son of Man his falsehoods and his temptations could not prevail. But the judgment was not yet executed; only with the Parousia of the Son of Man would the end of evil arrive, and the intermediate period was marked by an increased activity of the hostile power.

This view was not held by Jesus only, but also by primitive Christianity as a whole. The traditional eschatological drama implied the idea that demonism attains to its greatest manifestation of power immediately before the final crisis (*cf.* the Apocalypse; 2 Thess. ii.). This increasing activity of Satan was noted by Jesus at the same time that he experienced his own victories over him and his subservient demons; he noted it not only in the lack of receptivity on the part of the people, but also in the growing hostility of their leaders, a hostility that he perceived would bring about his death. It would seem to be incontrovertible that behind this hostility Jesus saw the great Adversary, and that this conviction shaped his thoughts of his coming death. It took the form of the realization, both that his death was inevitable, and that it would mean deliverance and victory; Satan's triumph would be his undoing.

This thought is clearly expressed in the Fourth Gospel. "The Prince of this world cometh . . ." (xiv. 30), he advances to the attack. But at the same time judgment is to be held on him, he is to be cast out (xii. 31, xvi. 11). The two aspects are united in the thought that Jesus' death is a "lifting-up," a "glorification." Death, it is true, puts him for a short while in Satan's power, but at the same time it forms the transition

* "The Strong One," Mark iii. 27, most certainly has a double meaning from the very first; purely figurative, but with an allusion to Satan. The translation "the strong man," therefore, is not exact. The translation "men of violence," in Matt. xi. 12, makes the same mistake (in the English Bible as in the Swedish.—Tr.)

to the heavenly life with the Father, in which Jesus will be able to draw all men unto him. Death is assuredly death with all its horror; but it is also the means of transformation, of deliverance from Satan's power, and a "lifting-up" beyond the range of his activity.

This genuinely Johannine thought has no direct counterpart in the Synoptic tradition. Yet we might trace it in such an utterance as Luke xxiv. 26: "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into his glory?" In Luke we find also the clearest expression of Jesus' consciousness of the demonism lying behind the enmity against him (xxii. 3, 31, 53). Of these sayings xxii. 31 perhaps gives the impression of being the most original: "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you in order to sift you as wheat. . . ." It is like a glimpse of what is going on behind the curtain, in the mysterious depths beneath the outward events: dark powers are on the march to annihilate the fruits of Jesus' messianic ministry. When to this we add the other allusions in this vein, it is no unfounded assumption that Jesus went to meet his death in the conviction that Satan was behind the enmity against him, and at the same time that only through his death could the Enemy's power over Israel be definitely broken. Therefore it was his Father's will that he performed in drinking the cup. The strange paradox that he, who was the stronger than Satan, should succumb to the power of evil and thereby break it—this paradox was involved in his situation as the Son of Man in lowliness, but having his high vocation, and all the while an instrument of God's will.

A direct expression of this conviction in the mind of Jesus can probably be found only in Mark x. 45: "The Son of Man is not come to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (*λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν*).

The scepticism that has prevailed with regard to this passage, refusing to assign it to the oldest stratum of the tradition, is now beginning to give way to a readiness to accept it: and rightly. It was long considered as certain that it was no more than a Pauline variant of Luke xxii. 27; but now there is a growing tendency to assign it to the oldest Palestinian tradition. This is supported by the use of the term "Son of Man" and the phrase "for many," which in the Talmud means "the multitude," "the people." Nor has *λύτρον* any direct equivalent in the Pauline terminology, though we have there *ἀντίλυτρον*, *λύτρωσις*, *ἀπολύτρωσις*, and the terms based on the idea of purchase and price (*ἀγοράζειν*, etc.).* And the fact that

* *Vide* Martin Werner, *Der Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium* 1923, p. 69 ff.

this, the only interpretation given by Jesus of the meaning of his death (apart from the words uttered at the Last Supper), does not occur in the form of a dogmatic statement, but as part of a parenthesis, serves to support its authenticity.

But what does it mean? The saying clearly presupposes the Jewish conception of vicarious suffering (*ἀντί*). But that general idea can take various forms. It can have a cultic-sacral significance or else a more practical meaning; a historical element may also be involved.* Hence the question concerning the actual relation between the death and its redemptive effect, may be answered merely by pointing to the fact that those who heard the words found in them a coherent meaning. The problem then is to find the historically correct background for the redemptive act: what is the bondage from which the Son of Man is to ransom mankind by his ministering death? From bondage under the guilt of sin?† From the tyranny of death?‡ If, however, we seek an organic connection between this saying and Jesus' view of the situation that was leading on to his redemptive death, then it is fair to look for the historical meaning of the saying on the line of his conflict with Satan, as the continuation and the completion of that conflict.

On account of the scarcity of direct material on which to build, we must try to gain a correct historical view by noting that which precedes and that which follows; that is to say, how did Jesus interpret the situation which was so rapidly and so plainly developing towards its awful issue? And what was the idea of this drama in primitive Christianity? If then the *λύτρον* passage fits in naturally, as a connecting link, between the answers to these two questions, then this interpretation will be to a certain extent confirmed.

The answer to the first question has been already given. Starting from Jesus' exorcisms, I have tried to show that in his Messianic ministry he felt himself pitted against a formidable adversary, who was seeking to undo the results of his teaching, and to bring to ruin him and his disciples.§ True, he knew himself to be the stronger than Satan, and he had continual experience of his power over the unclean spirits, Satan's ministers. But the people as a whole were in the power of evil, stricken with blindness and hardened against truth, fettered

* G. Hollmann, *Die Bedeutung des Todes Jesu*, 1901, p. 33; Lyder Brun, *Jesu evangelium*, 2nd ed., 1926, p. 487 ff. For Jewish ideas of the meaning of the martyrs for the nation, cf. E. Lohmeyer, *L'idée du martyre dans le Judaïsme et dans le Christianisme primitif* in the volume dedicated to Loisy, 1928, ii., p. 121 ff.

† Thus, for instance, Zahn.

‡ J. Jeremias, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, Chemnitz, 1928. Lyder Brun unites both views.

§ Also in the storm on the sea Jesus seems to have recognized an attack from demons. Cf. the command: "Peace, be still!" (Mark iv. 39).

by the iron chains of evil. How were they to be delivered from this bondage?*

One of the answers that the Primitive Church gave to this question was: Through the death of Jesus. Origen formulated this idea and rationalized it: the souls of men were in Satan's power on account of sin; Jesus gave his soul (life) up to death as a ransom, which Satan accepted for men's souls; but on Jesus' pure, sinless soul he could not retain his hold. The agreement, however, must stand, and thus the souls in Sheol and on earth were freed from Satan's power. This redemption is seen in its effects when Christian exorcists drive out demons in the name of Jesus.†

Origen in all probability here builds upon elements of popular belief, which had lived a subterranean, non-literary life, till the great theologian brought them into the light. We might trace these same ideas also in Irenæus:‡ Christ, in virtue of his obedience and righteousness, which he showed also in his death, has overcome sin, death, and the Devil, and delivered men from the bondage they incurred through the fall. The fallen angel, who deceived the first man, has been defeated by the Son of Man. Also in the Apologists§ we meet with the idea that Christ's death delivered mankind from the demonic powers, just as the demons henceforth are expelled through the name of the Crucified.

The *Epistle to the Hebrews* (ii. 14) also expresses the idea that Jesus entered human life "that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." And in *Acts* ii. 24 we read that God raised up Christ, "having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that he (Jesus) should be holden of it (death)." In all these phrases there is revealed a very real conviction of an *activity* in Jesus' death: it is a victory over the devil and over death.

If now we return to the saying of Jesus in Mark x. 45, we perceive that the self-sacrifice of the Son of Man in giving himself up to death is there treated as part of his ministering work—indeed, as the completion of that work, hence as an *activity*. With this idea might very well be connected that of the death of the righteous as a purifying of the people, an expiation of its sins. This idea or complex of ideas was of old connected with martyrdom,|| but when we seek to draw the direct connecting line between the ministering activity of Jesus, as described in the Synoptic tradition, and his death, we must

* W. Michaelis, *Täufer, Jesus, Urgemeinde*, 1928, p. 73, 103, shows a remarkable superficiality and lack of realism in his treatment of this problem.

† *In Joh.* vi. 53; *c. Cels.* I., 31, chapters vii., viii., *passim*.

‡ *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 18, 7, etc.

§ Justin, *Apol.* ii. 6, 13; *Dial.*, 30.

|| *E.g.*, *Isa.* liii.

take as our starting point Jesus' conflict with the great enemy, the Lord of the evil spirits. Jesus calls himself a *λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν*, convinced that in going to death of his own free will he will bring to nought Satan's power on Satan's own ground.

If so, we are here within the same range of ideas which we found in the Fourth Gospel, with regard to Jesus' death; only that in this gospel the victory over the Prince of the World is characterized as a *judgment* on him, by force of which he is to be cast out. To this judgment on Satan corresponds the *justification* of Jesus, his exaltation to the triumph and majesty of "glory": the Paraclete shall convince the world of righteousness because Jesus goes to his Father, and of judgment because the Prince of this world is judged.*

The idea of resurrection and exaltation does not—so it seems—fall directly in with the idea of the *λύτρον*; it is death and Sheol that form the scene of the redemption. And it is probably the oldest interpretation of Jesus' death that the death is the victory; the resurrection (glorification) comes as the reward, the seal, the completion, the manifestation of the result.

The assurance of Jesus that in his death he would meet Satan in battle on Satan's own ground, sprang in the first instance from his own *experience*, from his interpretation of his own situation. But this interpretation coincided with the "mythical" view of the universe: death and evil were associated, and together they held mankind in bondage. This "mythical" view of the universe, as a background for the idea of redemption, can be traced also later, in the Church, particularly in Paul.† In the leading theologians and writers, however, other lines of thought, based upon personal-religious and ethical principles, take precedence.‡ But the idea of the victory over Satan and his hosts continued to live in the popular imagination, only appearing rarely in literature, but serving as the ground for the exorcistic practice of the Church. A variation of this popular conception may be detected in the idea of Jesus' victorious descent to Hades. It is a genuine popular dogma, which at an early time was linked up with various versions of an Oriental salvation myth.§

* John xvi. 11 f. The picture of the good shepherd who assails the wolf and surrenders his life for his sheep is also an "active" trait.

† Stressed by W. Wrede, *Paulus (Rel-gesch. Volksbücher)*, 1904. Cf. E. Lohmeyer, *Kyrios Jesus*, 1928. One might point to such passages as 1 Cor. ii. 28; Gal. iv. 3 ff.; Phil. ii. 6-11; Col. i. 13, ii. 15.

‡ F. Krarup (*Dansk Teol. Tidsskr.*, 1921) rightly emphasizes that also in these other lines of thought the *active* side is easily under-rated.

§ 1 Pet. iii. 18 ff.; Eph. iii. 8 ff.; Hermas, *Sim.*, ix. 16, 5 ff.; Justin, *Dial.* 72 etc.; J. Kroll, *Der descensus ad inferos*, Königsberg, 1922; W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 1913, 32-40; *Zeitschr. f. d. Neutestl. Wissenschaft*, 1926; Carl Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern*, 1919, pp. 456-576.

The Gospel tradition presents us with a continual balance of *actio* and *passio* in the life of Jesus. He is the object of temptations and trials (πειρασμοί) on the part of the Devil and his hosts, and finally he gives himself up, unresisting, into the hands of sinners, to be ill-treated, mocked, put to death. But he it is also who repels the attacks by God's word and his own irresistible wisdom. He speaks with an authority that moves men and strikes them with awe. He is the Stronger One who binds the Strong One and spoils his house.

The psychological problem arising here, the question of the development of Jesus' soul-life, his thoughts and feelings in his contradictory situation—a problem reaching its climax of difficulty in Jesus' death—this problem lies beyond the scope of the historian. It can only be stated that both the above-mentioned aspects are found in the tradition. The history of Jesus is not presented as a story of *martyrdom* exclusively, although the idea of martyrdom with its passivity has its place there. Still less does the tradition take the form exclusively of an *aretology*, a series of triumphs and glorious deeds, an epos of the Messianic hero; but this, too, is woven into the picture. The antinomy of these two sides is the antinomy of life itself, and it forms the very best demonstration of the truthfulness of the tradition. It is no product of a theory or reflection of an ideal. It is a transcript of historical fact.

It is fruitless to attempt to harmonize the two sides of the tradition by psychological construction. The spiritual history of the passion of Jesus is, and remains, a mystery. What we can get into touch with is the religious value of the wholeness of his personality, the self-consciousness of Jesus, and his reaction to outward reality.*

* The two sides of the tradition concerning Jesus have been particularly stressed by Georg Bertram in his short but important article *Neues Testament und historische Methode* (Tübingen, 1928, *Sammlung gemeinverständlicher Vorträge*, No. 134). Bertram holds it to be removed beyond every possible doubt that both sides go back to Jesus himself. But at the same time he keeps to a strict *kultus-historisch* treatment of the sources. This is in keeping with his methodical view of the aim of historical scholarship: the object of history is not to reconstruct the historical personality—that would be a falsification of history, since the scholar's own rational view of the world must determine his reconstruction. The picture resulting from such a method—this holds true both of the idealistic and the materialistic historical schools—is dependent on the personal presuppositions of the scholar and highly arbitrary, and increasingly arbitrary in proportion to the scantiness of the sources. History in this way merely becomes a form of tradition, by the side of myth, legend, and fiction, yet of less value than these, since in such a rational reproduction of the past, reduced to strict causality, there is no room for the creative agencies of history, the great, original personalities. From this it follows that the usual time "schema" for the description of the origin of Christianity must be dispensed with. What can and should be described, is the evidence we have of the religious life and conceptions of the primitive Christian congregations. The Synoptists, St. Paul, St. John, will then not appear one after the other as links in a chain of historical development, but rather stand side by side, as being all equally effects of Jesus' preaching, his life and death. To desire to get behind these testimonies to Jesus himself, is to attempt the

This self-consciousness of Jesus is revealed in a bright light by short episodes and pregnant sayings. The detailed interpretation of these episodes and sayings must of course be more or less hypothetical. But out of the scattered traits there arises a whole picture, which in its double-sidedness bears the mark of reality, the stamp of life.

This conclusion is confirmed by the fact that the same double-sidedness appears in the after-results of the life-work of Jesus. The primitive Church extolled martyrdom for Christ's sake, and presented Jesus as the great example of suffering patience, retaining as a living element in its consciousness the idea of the purifying, re-creative, expiatory power of suffering.* At the same time the earliest Christianity lived and moved in the conflict against Satan and the whole spiritual host of evil,† with the conviction that the power of demonism had been broken by Jesus' death. Thus the very *passio* of the martyrs was also an *actio*. In their great *peirasmos* they must hold steadfastly to their confession of faith, that they might share in Christ's victory.

ANTON FRIDRICHSEN.

AN EARLY PASSION PLAY

THIS short paper is offered in the hope of drawing attention to an interesting and neglected work—namely, the Passion Play, "Christus Patiens," which has been attributed to no less a person than S. Gregory Nazianzen, with date about A.D. 389. The Greek text, with Latin versions on the same page, is printed in Migne's *Patrologia*, vol. xxxviii., following a number of poems by Gregory—viz., "Epitaphia" and "Epigrammata."

The Greek title of the play is *Χριστὸς πάσχων*, and it is described in one of the MSS. as "in the manner of Euripides,"

impossible. Jesus can be grasped only in the results of his life-work, in the *Kristus-kultus*, the Christian religion. Starting from this methodical basis, Bertram discusses the Gospel tradition and finds there two types of narratives concerning Jesus: "Prophet legends," in which Jesus is the active, healing, demon-expelling man, and "ætiological cult-narratives," in which Jesus-Messiah-the Son of Man, is the sufferer, the passive. Both aspects go back to the historical life of Jesus. But to unite them in a total view of the personality of Jesus is methodically inadmissible. With all his well-warranted reaction against "historicism," and his instructive emphasis on the *kultus-historisch* view, Bertram is guilty of a violent exaggeration and onesidedness in his fundamental conception of history and historical scholarship. History cannot possibly be viewed as consisting of mere complexes, motives, types; it must also be brought under the categories of time, space, and personality. But Bertram's reaction against the "historicism" and "psychologism," which have for a long time served to discredit the modern treatment of the history of Jesus, is quite comprehensible.

* Cf., e.g., 1 Pet. iv. 1 ff.

† 1 Thess. v. 8; Eph. vi. 11-18; 1 Pet. v. 8 f.

which is justified to some extent by the number of allusions to and quotations from such works as "Medea," "Troades," "Rhesus," "Orestes," "Hippolytus," "Bacchæ," etc.

The editor of the volume (printed in 1862) is A. B. Caillau, who prefaces the tragedy with an instructive "Monitum" from which it appears likely that the author of the play is *not* Gregory Nazianzen, but some other, perhaps a Gregory who was Bishop of Antioch in 572. Caillau comes to this conclusion on several grounds: (a) That the name of the great Gregory (Theologus) does not appear in MSS., in fact there is only one where it is found; and in another case the tragedy is just appended to the works of S. Gregory. (b) The doctrine taught in the play is not in correspondence with that found in Gregory's other works, whether poems, letters, or otherwise. (c) The Blessed Mother is represented as an extremely timorous character, altogether different from the person described by (say) S. Ambrose, who says, "I read that the Mother was *standing* before the Cross, I see nothing about *weeping*," and again, "It was the *men* who ran away; she stood, intrepid."

Also, some of the violent words given to the Blessed Virgin—*e.g.*, against Judas—are inappropriate. (They could scarcely be otherwise, considering where they came from: see line 352 or 1440.)

(d) The mention of churches erected and ceremonies performed in honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary is not likely to correspond with facts at the early date supposed. See the play, line 966.

(e) The general style of the versification, etc., is not up to Gregory's standard. Finally, the Editor does not think Apollinaris can be the author. Apollinaris, who was a contemporary of Gregory, held unorthodox views as to Christ's humanity, which were opposed by Athanasius, at Constantinople, in the year 381.

Since Caillau's time, the work has been edited by J. G. Brambs, whose text and notes were published by Teubner in 1885. Brambs had previously published an essay in 1883 dealing with the authorship of "Christus Patiens," in which he definitely concluded that it could not be by Gregory of the fourth century; and in his Teubner edition actually dragged the date down to as late as the twelfth century. He goes so far as to suggest an author of that century to whom he ascribes this play, namely, Theodore Prodromus, scholar and poet.

The Benedictine editor of the play gives many of the quotations from Euripides in his notes. Brambs has done it still more thoroughly, with eight pages of references to seven plays.*

* Euripides is not the only author made use of. Æschylus (*Agam.* and *P.V.*), Lycophron, Acts of Pilate, and several books of the Old and New Testaments, are drawn upon.

This method of "composing" a work is foreign to the modern mind, and may be illustrated thus, for those who have not seen "Christus Patiens." Suppose a modern author to write a Gospel play, introducing, say, the "Beatitudes." Instead of writing simply, "Jesus said, 'Blessed are the merciful, for they shall receive mercy,'" he would perhaps write:

" 'And blessed are the merciful,' He said,
 'For they, in turn, shall mercy's gift obtain' ";

or

" 'The merciful are doubly blest,' He said,
 'And pity shall be yours for pity's sake.' "

But the writer of "Christus Patiens" would not do this. He would think of a classic passage dealing with mercy, and would then write:

"The quality of mercy . . . is twice bless'd:
 It blesseth him that gives and him that takes":

where all the words are Shakespeare's, somewhat disordered, but the meaning exactly as in the Gospel itself.

The authorship of the "Christus Patiens" therefore remains uncertain. But its merits are not to be passed over on that account.

On May 26 this year (1930) I was asked to speak to a meeting of S.T.C. at Cambridge. The subject was "The History of the Passion Services." Naturally, the musical settings of the Passion Gospels were the main feature of the lecture, Bach, Handel, Schütz, Gallus, Vittoria, Byrd, Davy, etc., with the ancient "Cantus Passionis," still sung, after many centuries of use, and showing, as all the other settings show, that the story of the Passion is a drama, and can only be done properly in a dramatic form of some sort.

For this reason, I told my audience the little I knew about the "Suffering Messiah" play, and read a portion of the long dialogue between Joseph of Arimathea and Mary, on the subject of the Burial of the Lord, from line 1268 to line 1278.

The characters in the play are eight in number: Christ, the Virgin Mary, Joseph, Theologus, Mary Magdalene, Nicodemus, a Messenger, Pilate, besides the very important choruses, one of High Priests, the other of Young Women, and a semi-chorus, a Young Man, and the Guard (who has a fine scene with Pilate about the disappearance of the Lord's Body).*

One of the Greek titles of the play runs thus: "Verses of Gregory Theologus on the saving suffering of our Lord Jesus

* The play begins with a long speech by the Blessed Virgin Mary (Migne, *Patrologia*, vol. xxxviii. (Greek), col. 138, or Brambs, in Teubner edition, p. 25).

Christ, and on Judas the disciple, how he betrayed the Lord with the kiss of treachery."

The Blessed Virgin prologizes in a speech of over eighty lines, in which are phrases from Euripides, several from the *Medea*, and one or two from *Hecuba* and *Rhesus*.

Line 1:

B.V.M. (*θεοτόκος, Deipara*). Would that the Serpent ne'er had
crawled his way
Into the Garden; nor the wily snake
Had made his home in those delightful vales.

* * * * *

Line 88:

Now must I hurry forth into the night
And see what evil has befall'n my Son.

(*Points at Chorus.*) Though these would have me tarry till the dawn.

CHORUS (*Women*). O Lady, cloak thyself forthwith, for men
Running from out the doors are plainly seen.

B.V.M. What's this? sure tidings of mine enemies!
A hidden band of men on guard at night?

CHORUS. At night indeed, but far from silent they.
I see a mighty army in the gloom,
With torches waving and with flashing swords.

B.V.M. And who is this so swift of foot who comes
To meet us? Sure some news he has to tell.
Let me the message hear, and hear it all.

CHORUS. O lady venerable, virgin pure—
Alas, alas, ah me! . . .

O thou, of name renown'd in every land.
O chaste, O spotless, honour'd by us all,
Once called The Blessed, now shalt wretched be.

B.V.M. What does this mean? Does someone want to kill me?

CHORUS. Nay! 'tis thy Son by evil men is slain.

B.V.M. Ay me! What say'st thou? Wouldst thou kill me, woman?

(Omit from line 112 to line 130, when the messenger appears.)

Line 130:

MESSENGER. O misery! Ah me! O beauteous Mary—
Lady revered, we perish, not by hand
Of foeman, but—

B.V.M. What ails thy voice? O speak!
What new report can fright thee so?

CHORUS. Alas!
Hast thou not heard?—oh, list!—and hearing know
Who has betrayed thy Son unto His murderers.

B.V.M. Strange fears thy words arouse—who was it, then?
Surely not one of his friends!

CHORUS. He bore the purse,
Evil disciple, guardian of the gold,
Greedy of gold he was—

B.V.M. O wretched me!
One ill upon another. Those who seemed
Steadfast in friendship have destroyed us all.

Line 152:

MESSENGER. Bad news indeed, but true: what shall I tell?

He then describes how Jesus ordered the Supper, and tells of the washing of the disciples' feet, the walk to the Mount of Olives, and quoting twice from *Bacchæ* between ll. 165-170, refers to the Gospel of St. John xii. 28 ff., using the words (see l. 161): *πάτερ, μέγιστον νῦν πάρασχέ μοι κλέος* (l. 170: *ὡς βροντῶν ὅπα*); l. 172: *καὶ πρὶν κλείσας νῦν κλείσω σε πλέον*.

("O Father, now give me greatest glory." And a voice like thunder said:

"I glorified thee formerly, and now will I glorify thee more.")

Column 165, line 358:

CHORUS (*weeping*). Aiah, Aiah!
Be silent now, for nevermore thy Son
Living shalt thou behold.

B.V.M. Ay me! Why weep'st thou?
What cause of grief is here?

CHORUS. I know not yet—but he who approaches yonder seems like to tell of thy beloved Son.

MESSENGER. Sentence is passed, today thy Son must die. The scribes and elders have decreed it so. (*Recollections of Orestes*, l. 859.)

B.V.M. Alas! Hope came near, I feared it of old, what time I was consumed with sorrow for that which should come! (*Electra's words*.)

Line 693: The B.V.M. rushes off to the Cross.

Line 727: Christ says: "Behold thy son."

Line 813: Peter, weeping at the Cross.

Line 821: Christ forgives Peter, and tells B.V.M. to go.

Line 834: His last words before death, partly in words of Jason in *Mædea*, line 932.

B.V.M. *ends*: Or who may withstand Thy wrath? (*De profundis*, v. 3.)

CHRIST. Go now, escape from the midst of mine enemies.

Line 835:

As for the matters thou didst speak of with me,
Some are done with, the rest will I remember.
And here for thee I let this tale go by.

B.V.M. then describes the "loud cry" from the Cross.

Line 850:

She sees He is dead. Her long speech interrupted by Theologus at line 932.

THEOLOGUS. Be of good cheer, O lady ruler of us all, O thou that long'st to weep. Freely he accepted his death, he was not forced to die: but trampling on death the devourer, he brings an avenger to all, God the Almighty.

Scene between the PRIESTS and the GUARD, and (later) PILATE, in re the Resurrection. (See Bacchæ, 1082, 768, 786.)

Line 2255:

GUARD. Just then it thundered, and the lightning shone
O'er earth and sky, a sign of holy fire.

Hushed was the welkin, hushed the leaves
Of all the wooded vale; no sound was heard.

(*Very earnestly*) Whoever this man is, accept him now,

He is some great one; and indeed 'tis said

Amongst the people, that he brings a gift

To mortal men, endowing them with grace

Resisting evil, and they say that he

Is Righteousness itself, nor is there good

Apart from him: and if this be the truth,

Then rather would I sacrifice to him,

Than, like a madman, kicking 'gainst the pricks,

Fight against God, poor mortal as I am.

PRIEST. Thou wast but sound asleep, thou speak'st in dreams.

(*Very quietly*). 'Twas while you slept that the disciples came

And stole the body—stole it while you slept.

This to the Governor tell, and this alone.

As for the rest, be silent, and this gold

Is thine—'tis plain, thou hast the body sold.

(*The GUARD starts violently.*) Say aught but this—the Governor shall
know!

GUARD. You take no heed of what I tell to you.

But this I say, though evil be your speech,

You must not rage at me, but silence keep.

The story will not hold—the seal is there.

The seal alone would show we have not sold him.

You have no hook to hang the tale upon:

The stone still lying on the tomb—

(*He pauses, then suddenly shouts out*) Great God!

A marvel, new, prodigious, can it be!

He's risen from the grave! . . .

PRIEST. Come, say no more, and take thy money now.

Line 2283:

GUARD (*getting angry*). You disregard my words, but I, it seems,

Must hear you speak, and act upon it too!

Just look at this one point: how will you free

Me from the Governor's wrath?

PRIEST.

No need to fear;

I'll tell a tale will suit both him and you.

Specimen of dialogue, p. 238 (column), MARY and JOSEPH of Arimathea.

Line 1268:

B.V.M. Fearful am I and unhappy, not to behold my Son, dead though
he be, till the tomb receive him. Why should I fly the crowd, fearing to
suffer some evil? Now I have lost my Son, what pleasure in life remains
for me?

Dead is my Son, suffer me to mourn him, to bury him, to touch his feet, to stretch his limbs. *Line 1274: Come, wretched hands, and lift thy dead.*

JOSEPH. Lay not a hand on him; touch not thy dead, in no wise. For with these my hands will I bury him forthwith, I and Nicodemus as my company, bringing great store of ointments and perfumes.

Migne, vol xxxviii., columns 325-326, quite near the end of *Χριστος πασχων*, line 2412. Brambs says line 2415.

CHORUS. And Peter, with John the beloved
Hurrying to the tomb, which held Life in it,
And having considered all things, said to the disciples—
Even as Magdalene Mary said . . . viz. that the tomb was empty. . . .

B.V.M. Truly the first at the tomb was she, and
I her friend followed forthwith
And we saw that empty which had been a tomb. . . .
Then ran Mary and told the disciples.
Peter arose, and ran to the sepulchre, he and another young man, and
saw what Mary said, . . .

Let *her* speak now, and tell what was seen and done.

MAGDALENE. What say'st thou, Lady, joy of human race?

B.V.M. Tell thou again what I have told to these,
Of what thou didst see, and of what His friends reported.

MAGDALENE. All happened, Lady, as thou didst say.

She goes on about the two men in white garments, etc.,
finishing: "how they recognized Him as He broke the bread."

Continued at line 2494 (CHRIST appears):

MAGDALENE. Ah! Ah! Silent be!
Look! there He stands, the Lord Himself—
There in the doorway! . . .

(*Aside*) How is He there, with the doors shut? . . .

Line 2501:

CHRIST. Peace to you!
Why are ye thus loud in amazement?
These hands—behold—and these feet!
And my wounded side!
Look well—take good note—it is
I myself. A spirit has no flesh, nor can there be bones in a spirit.

* * * * *

Line 2509:

As my father sent me hither, so I, in my turn, send you out to the world.
And, O my beloved ones, I do breathe into you the Holy Ghost, whom
receiving, do ye preach me everywhere, together with the Father and
the all-hallowed Spirit.

Go forth, go forth, beloved heralds, singing a song of triumph through
the world: and girdling the houses of kings, announce to David's city,
that it may wholly see its saviour returning with all speed from the
tomb. Be ye my witnesses before the whole earth.

He shall save himself who, accepting my words, shall receive baptism,
at price of my blood. Likewise, he who refuses to hear your words

shall incur the condemnation of the unbelieving. And for this do I dower you with the grace of the divine Spirit. Whose bonds of sin ye shall untie, he shall be free of his chains. Whose bonds ye shall retain, with knots indissoluble let them remain.

The play ends here. Then follows "votum poetæ," as a conclusion to the whole work.

Line 2530 (line 2532 in Brambs) :

O Saviour, thou who breakest chains,
Free me from those whereby my negligence
Alas, hath bound me. The foe seductive hath burdened me with envy
Seeing me free from the bonds, not to be loosed till now,
Free by faith in Thee, Thy guerdon to the good.
Hail, O King Supreme, Son of the Highest,
Thou who hast trodden under foot the Serpent, origin of evil
And hast overcome Death, our last enemy.

* * * * *

Line 2554 (Bacchæ, line 1342, CADMUS to DIONYSOS; Brambs, line 2557):

O Redeemer, we beseech Thee,
We who have done unjustly
In body, soul, and mind most miserably:
Before Thee have we sinned,
And oft transgressed Thy law.

At line 2569: Prayer directly to B.V.M.

(Line 2572 in Brambs) : Full of allusions to Greek plays.

*Finishing : Grant me, O Lady, release from my stumblings,
And afford me my soul's salvation.*

The play has 2,601 lines in all.

FINIS.

ADDITIONAL NOTE

Directions for acting the little play "Quem queritis" (or "Officium sepulchri"), which was popular in the tenth century as an interpolation (or "trope") to Matins on Easter Sunday. Translated from the *Winchester Troper* (Henry Bradshaw Society, vol. vii., 1894), and given here by kind leave of the Editor, W. H. Frere, now Bishop of Truro. The exact place where the drama was introduced may be found in the Office Book for Holy Week, as published by the Benedictines of Solesmes, p. 674, where the third of three lessons from S. Gregory the Great is read. Three responds are sung between the lessons, and all deal with the visit of the holy women to the empty tomb.

The directions, from the *Regularis Concordia* of S. Ethelwold, begin "Dum tertia recitatur lectio," etc.

While the third lesson is being read, four of the brothers robe themselves, one of whom is clad in white, and must approach the place of the sepulchre privately as if engaged on some other matter, and having reached it, should sit quiet there with a palm in his hand. And while the third respond is being sung through, the remaining three follow, all robed in copes, and holding in their hands the thuribles with incense, and they should approach the place of the sepulchre step by step, as if imitating people looking for something.

Now these things are done to represent the Angel sitting in the tomb, and the women coming with their spices to anoint the Body of Jesus.

When therefore he who is sitting there sees these three approaching him as if uncertain of their way, and apparently looking for something, let him begin with a moderately strong voice and sweet tone to sing "Quem queritis," and when this has been sung right through, the three reply with one voice, "Jesum Nazarenum"; then he replies to them, "Non est hic: surrexit sicut predixerat. Ite nuntiate quia surrexit a mortuis." At this his command, let the three turn round and face the Choir, saying, "Alleluia, surrexit Dominus."

This having been said, he who sits in the tomb, as if calling them back, says the Antiphon "Venite et videte locum," and as he says this, let him rise up and lift the veil, showing them the place bare of the cross, but with the linen still placed in which the cross had been wrapped.

When they have seen this, let them put down the thuribles which they were carrying in the same sepulchre, and take the linen, holding it out to the "clerum" as if to show them that the Lord is risen, and no longer wrapped in it, then let them sing the Antiphon "Surrexit dominus de sepulchro," and place the linen on the altar.

When the Antiphon is done, the Prior, rejoicing with them for the triumph of our King, who having conquered death, has risen again, should start the hymn "Te Deum laudamus," and then all the bells should be rung at once.

The original of this is printed on p. xvii of Dr. Frere's *Winchester Troper*. The complete words are on p. 17 (further on in the book). The music, from a thirteenth century *Dublin Troper*, can be recovered from a tiny photograph on the very last page of the same book, right hand of the top line.

ANGEL.



THREE WOMEN.



ANGEL.



et vi - de - te lo cum u - bi po - si - tus fu - e - rat.

THREE WOMEN. CHORUS. *sic*

Al - le - lu - ia, Re - sur - rex - it do - mi - nus.. Al - le - lu - ia,

Re - sur - rex - it do - mi - nus.. Hoc di - e re - sur - rex - it

po - tens, for - tis Chri - stus fi - li - us..... De - i.

ANGEL.

Et e - un - tes di - ci - te dis - ci - pu - lis e - jus et Pe - tro

Sequitur Te Deum.

qui - a sur - rex - it. Te De - um lau - da mus. etc.

And so ends Matins.

A form much like the above is in Migne, vol. cxlvii., Latin, p. 137, and another for the visit of the Three Kings to the Cradle, as used at Rouen (Rotomagensis) in the eleventh century.

E. W. NAYLOR.

DONNE'S RELIGIOUS DEVELOPMENT

NOTHING is more remarkable about Donne than the contrast between the way in which he spent his youth and the way he spent his old age. Walton, who has left the most detailed portrait of Donne in his later years, was clearly struck by it, and his few and somewhat reluctant references to Donne's dissolute past are usually made in order to emphasize the "sanctification" of his life as a priest. Indeed, he speaks sometimes as if the Donne he knew and the Donne of the *Songs and Sonets* were two different personalities, a distinction to which Donne himself lends some apparent support by his playful reference, in a letter, to "Jack Donne" and "Dr. Donne." Towards the

end of his *Life*, Walton refers to the well-known portrait of Donne "at his age of eighteen, with his sword, and what other adornments might then suit with the present fashions of youth, and the giddy gaieties of that age," and its Spanish motto, "Antes Muerto que Mudado," and exclaims, "If that young, and his now dying picture, were at this time set together, every beholder might say, Lord! how much is Dr. Donne already changed before he is changed!" There were changes, indeed, which might have inspired such an exclamation, and they were striking enough: the love-poet had become a preacher, the dissolute layman an ascetic and a priest, the Roman Catholic an Anglican, and, it might well be thought, the sceptic a believer. But Walton was guilty of a significant mistranslation; Donne's motto really meant "Sooner dead than changed"; and Walton's account of the matter, with its suggestion of a dual personality, is very far from the truth. It is worth while examining in some detail the changes which took place in Donne's life, in order to correct an impression which may impose on the casual reader of Donne as is imposed on Donne's first biographer.

On the contrast to be examined it is scarcely necessary to dwell. Whatever theory he may hold about the relation that usually subsists between experience and its poetic expression, a reader of Donne's poems can scarcely deny that his *Songs and Sonets* and *Elegies* reflect a life spent largely in the successful pursuit of physical pleasure. All the surviving accounts of Donne's youth confirm this impression. For the other side of the contrast it is only necessary to turn to the writings of Donne's later years, or to Walton's account of the rigidly ascetic discipline under which those years were spent. Donne's own consciousness of the contrast comes out often in his Sermons, and perhaps nowhere more vividly than in the third of his *Holy Sonnets*:

"O might those sighes and teares returne againe
 Into my breast and eyes, which I have spent,
 That I might in this holy discontent
 Mourne with some fruit, as I have mourn'd in vaine;
 In mine Idolatry what showres of raine
 Mine eyes did waste? what griefs my heart did rent?
 That sufferance was my sinne; now I repent;
 'Cause I did suffer I must suffer paine."*

It is due, no doubt, to consciousness of this contrast that Donne quotes St. Augustine more than any other Father of the Church, and that he made it a custom, about the time of

* Grierson, *Poems*, 1930, p. 294. Cf. too Sonnet xiii.: "As in my idolatrie I said to all my profane mistresses," etc.

the feast of the Conversion of St. Paul, to preach in his cathedral on that subject.*

Yet Donne's experience was not really like that of either of these great converts; there was never with him a moment such as those in which they heard the words "Tolle, lege," and "Why persecutest thou me?" He was not, like them (and this was where Walton made his error), one of the "twice-born," some of the changes which inspired Walton's exclamation "que Mudado!" were illusory, some were very different from what they appeared to be.

To begin with, it seems improbable that Donne was ever a sceptic. It is wrong to suppose that scepticism is implied by his unprincipled pursuit of pleasure in the days when (to use his own words) he "went with the tide."† Equally is it wrong to think that scepticism is disproved by the intense interest in theological speculation and religious controversy which Donne displayed from his earliest years, unlikely though it is that this interest was purely cynical and was combined with a complete disbelief in the truth of the fundamental doctrines which such controversy presupposed. The surest proof that Donne, even from his earliest years and even in his most dissolute days, believed in God, is to be found in the fact that atheism never infects his earliest writings, and is never made a matter of self-reproach even in the most penitential writings of his later years. Atheism was not a common point of view in Donne's day; it was a point of view not easy to reach and not easy to maintain. Donne himself attacked it, almost pityingly, in his sermons.‡ His own sins were ever before him, and if that had been one, we should be made aware of the fact somewhere in the works of one of the most introspective and self-critical writers in English. We need only look at one of his earliest poems to see that even in his most dissolute days religion was to Donne something more than a merely intellectual interest. In his third satire, written probably about the year 1594,§ Donne asks:

"Is not our Mistresse faire Religion
As worthy of all our Soules devotion,
As vertue was to the first blinded age?"

And that this was not asked in the spirit of a rhetorical question is shown by several passages later in the poem, "Know thy foes," he says, and he is addressing himself:

* See *LXXX. Sermons*, 1640, p. 476 C.

† Gosse, *Life and Letters*, i. 191.

‡ *LXXX. Sermons*, No. xlviii., p. 486 C.

§ Grierson, *Poems*, 1912, ii. 103.

"Know thy foes: The foule Devill (whom thou Strivest to please,) for hate, not love, would allow Thee faine, his whole Realme to be quit; and as The worlds all parts wither away and passe, So the worlds selfe, thy other lov'd foe, is In her decrepit wayne, and thou loving this, Dost love a withered and worne strumpet; last, Flesh (it selves death) and joyes which flesh can taste, Thou lovest; and thy faire goodly soule, which doth Give this flesh power to taste joy, thou dost loath. Seeke true religion."

There follows a famous passage, famous for the sympathy with which Donne allows the merits of each form of faith and pleads for more charity and toleration in religion, but chiefly relevant in this connection for the impressiveness with which he affirms the necessity of "true religion" for the soul's peace:

"On a huge hill,
Cragged, and steep, Truth stands, and hee that will
Reach her, about must, and about must goe;
And what the hills suddennes resists, winne so;
Yet strive so, that before age, death's twilight,
Thy Soule rest, for none can worke in that night."

That is not the language of the religious sceptic.

This more than intellectual interest in religion is not difficult to reconcile with Donne's early manner of life. Not much knowledge of human nature is needed to realize what extremes are reconcilable in the same personality, what logical and emotional inconsistencies may underlie the conduct of the most intelligent and the most conscientious of men. Consciousness of those inconsistencies in his own character may lead a man to emotional and intellectual unrest, and this "intermitting, aguish piety," sin followed by repentance, and repentance by sin, is by no means uncommon in religious natures. Donne's character was not of this sort. There is no trace of a conflict in his early emotional experiences. Nor was this effect bought by excluding the mind from the affairs of the body: in no love-poetry does intellect play a greater part than in Donne's; he reflected even while he felt, and the experiences he records are adventures of both the mind and the body at once. Yet the two are allies: the one is never in revolt from the other; and when he did suffer a revulsion—"the queasy pain of being beloved and loving"—it was a natural reaction, in which "conscience" played no part. The inconsistencies in his manner of life he did not realize, or did not realize as such. With Donne, belief and conduct lived in separate worlds, and if the one belied the other it was without a trace of hypocrisy. Donne

never came nearer to describing his own youthful attitude than when in a sermon he paints a picture of the "practicall Atheist, who though he doe pretend to make God, and God in Christ the object of his Faith, yet does not make Christ, and Christ in the Holy Ghost, that is, Christ working in the Ordinances of his Church, the rule and patterne of his actions, but lives so, as no man can beleieve that he beleieves in God."* In the "pretence" of this "ungodly liver" (as Donne proceeds to call him), there need be nothing false; his faith is a genuine faith; his ungodly living is not a conscious revolt from it, but simply shows how far his faith is from being an active influence upon his conduct.

In the record of Donne's religious development presented by his own writings, there is no trace of a conversion from scepticism to belief in God. It must have taken place, if at all, at a time—about 1597, when his more unsettled days came to an end—when it would certainly have left some mark on his letters or his poems. Yet neither at about that time nor later, in retrospect, do any of his writings give evidence of such a change having then taken place. And the record presented by these writings is so much an expression, so little an external account, of Donne's experience, that it is fair to say that in the development itself there is no room for such a conversion.

Nor is there room for such a change as would naturally be suggested by saying that from being a Roman Catholic he became an Anglican. The strong influence of Rome in Donne's upbringing is well known. Walton alludes to it several times, Donne himself more than once, and in words so striking that they have become famous.† His parents were both of "the old religion," his uncles were Jesuits, his brother was a martyr in the Jesuit cause; Donne was handed over in his earliest youth to tutors who were to instil into him by precept, as his family did by example, the duty of living and dying for the Church of Rome, and this tutelage followed him to the University, where he took no degree because the necessary oath was repugnant to strict Catholics. And behind all this was the long tradition of a family which, in Donne's words, was "accustomed to the Despite of Death, and hungry of an imagin'd Martyrdom." Nevertheless Donne was never, except nominally, a Roman Catholic. This was not because he lacked sympathy with the Roman Church; with that Church, from his birth till his death, he felt the deepest sympathy. It was because by the time that religion came to have any influence upon his life

* LXXX. *Sermons*, No. xlviii., p. 487 A.

† In the preface to *Pseudo-Martyr*.

and conduct he had already convinced himself intellectually that he owed allegiance to the Church of England. While he still wavered between Canterbury and Rome his faith was not of a sort to attach him, practically, to either or to any Church. The satire, quoted above, which reveals Donne's early interest in religion, equally reveals that he was as far from being at heart a Roman Catholic as he was from being at heart a sceptic. His decision not to adhere to the faith of his parents was made gradually, it was made on purely intellectual grounds, and it was made when Donne's religious life was at its lowest degree of intensity; he never was—he was only born—a Roman Catholic; he was not converted to Anglicanism, he simply discovered himself to be an Anglican.* Sympathy with the Church of Rome, on the other hand, he had never lacked, and he never lost it. At the end of his life he took to live with him in the Deanery of St. Paul's his aged mother, who never renounced her allegiance to the old faith. As late, probably, as 1617, after he had taken Orders in the English Church, he could write:

“ Show me deare Christ, thy spouse, so bright and clear.
What! is it She, which on the other shore
Goes richly painted? or which rob'd and free
Laments and mournes in Germany and here?”

In his middle years—probably in 1609†—he wrote in a letter words which describe his attitude throughout his life: “You know I never fettered nor imprisoned the word Religion, not straightening it friarly, *ad Religiones factitias* (as the Romans call well their orders of Religion), nor immuring it in a Rome, or a Wittenberg, or a Geneva; they are all virtual beams of one Sun . . . they are co-natural pieces of one circle. Religion is Christianity. . . .” He echoes these protestations, in a letter probably addressed to the same friend,‡ after he took Orders: “I will not, nor need to you, compare the religions. The channels of God's mercies run through both fields; and they are sister teats of his graces. . . .” It is to such letters as these, no doubt, that Donne alludes when, in the preface to his *Pseudo-Martyr*, he speaks of “my easines, to afford a

* Walton does not seem sure of his dates at that point of his narrative where he describes Donne's early theological studies, but the reference to Bellarmine suggests 1593-4. Two things seem clear: that theological reading was one of Donne's main interests during his early residence in London from 1590 onwards, and that by the time he returned from Essex's expedition in 1597 and accepted a post under Egerton, such connections as he had had with Rome were definitely broken. Yet he was far from being a docile and contented member of the English Church; in 1601 he was planning to make Calvin chief in the list of heretics in *The Progresse of the Soule*.

† Gosse, *Life and Letters*, i. 226.

‡ Gosse, ii. 78.

sweete and gentle Interpretation to all professors of Christian Religion, if they shake not the Foundation, wherein I have in my ordinary Communication and familiar writings often expressed and declared myself." His sermons are generally free from the bitterness which spoils the discourses of many of his contemporaries, and his occasional vehement attacks are usually directed against the Jesuits. The Jesuits (as is proved by the satire *Conclave Ignatii*, published in 1611) he had always hated fiercely, but such hatred was compatible even with full adherence to the Roman Church. Indeed it may well be (as Mr. Hutchinson has pointed out to me) that on other occasions his tilting at Rome was dictated by prudence, and was due to the consciousness that his known Roman Catholic origin and sympathies might breed distrust among his listeners if he did not occasionally remind them of the sincerity of his Anglicanism.

Donne, in youth as in age, was a Catholic in the broadest sense of that word. If that is not realized, his religious development cannot be properly understood. The change in his way of life—a change which led him from extremes of worldly to extremes of unworldly passion—was not connected with any change of belief. And it was a change which took place, not in a moment, but over many years. It was the development in him, under the stress of circumstances, of qualities which had always characterized him, the unfolding of certain traits which had always been an important part of his nature. At the same time other qualities and other characteristics lost their scope and were denied their activity. The vividness of the contrast between Donne in his youth and Donne in his old age tempts the observer to suppose that the change was revolutionary and was not a process of development, that some new element came to birth in Donne's character, that Donne became in some way a new man. Such an explanation is always easier and more immediately attractive than one less dramatic. But the true explanation, though it is more difficult to give, is the only one which fits the facts. The process of Donne's "sanctification" cannot well be analyzed: it was too gradual and too subtle for that. But, as in all cases of development, the earlier stages are only made intelligible by the later. We know the immense power and range of Donne's religious feeling, the domination is exercised over all his actions and all his thoughts, over all he wrote and said and did, during the last ten or fifteen years of his life. This new crop of thoughts and feelings spread in him and filled the gap made by the disappearance of the inordinate desires of his youth, desires which themselves died a natural death during the middle years of his life. Undoubtedly he had himself in mind when he wrote in his

Devotions:* "Our youth dies, and the sinnes of our youth with it; some sinnes die a violent death, and some a naturall; povertie, penurie, imprisonment, banishment, kill some sinnes in us, and some die of age." Almost every one of these had killed sins in Donne himself; almost all were the result of that imprudent marriage which Walton calls "the principal error of his life."†

At the beginning of 1602 Donne found himself the victim of a strange reversal of fortune. He was thirty. The giddiest days of his youth were over; for four years he had occupied the enviable post of secretary to the Lord Keeper, Sir Thomas Egerton. He was one of the most attractive, brilliant, and promising young men about the Court. True, like most of his friends, he had been a follower of Essex, and for the last year or two events at home and in Ireland had conspired to throw Essex's friends out of favour. In the letters which he wrote during the years 1597-1601, it plainly appears that he was by no means at ease in his surroundings. But he was at least secure; he had only to bide his time and the future would bring him whatever success he chose. In a few weeks the whole situation was changed: he was dismissed his post, thrown into prison, left with no prospects and next to no money and a wife to maintain: he had married secretly the niece of his employer, a girl of sixteen, and in doing so broken the civil and the canon law, enraged her father, and lost the favour of Sir Thomas Egerton.

For the next thirteen years "poverty, penury, and imprisonment"—to which we must add miserably ill-health, continually disappointed hopes, and a humiliating dependence upon the generosity of his social superiors—did their work on Donne. For two or three years he and his wife depended on the hospitality of her half-brother, Sir Francis Woolley: on his death in 1605 Donne set up house at Mitcham, where his wife lived with an ever-increasing family, keeping rooms (it seems) in London, where he spent much of his time hunting for an appointment. Some years were spent in travel in the suite of Sir Robert Drury, the patron of Joseph Hall, who in 1610 put at the disposal of Donne and his family rooms in Drury House. The exact story of Donne's residences, his movements, and his occupations in these years, it is difficult to trace, but the effect upon his mind of the colour and atmosphere of his life is very plain. The record of these years is as monotonous as

* Cambridge, 1923, p. 143.

† This phrase of Walton's has been misunderstood; Walton (as his references to Donne's married life clearly show) did not mean that Donne made a mistake in marrying Anne More, but simply that the clandestine wedding was a piece of foolishness which cost him dear.

must have been the spending of them. But to this period belong a large number of letters and one or two poems, which reveal more clearly than anything else the religious side of Donne's nature at the most critical stage of its development.

The nearest Donne comes to telling us how circumstances worked this change upon him is in a passage from the *Essays in Divinity*, the fragmentary meditations which survive from the period when he was making up his mind to enter into Holy Orders. He is commenting on *Exodus*, and, after general reflections on the mercies of God in delivering His servants from the "Egypt" of different sins, he mentions his own experience of God's mercy: "Thou hast delivered me, O God, from the Egypt of confidence and presumption, by interrupting my fortunes, and intercepting my hopes; and from the Egypt of despair, by contemplation of Thine abundant treasures, and my portion therein; from the Egypt of lust, by confining my affections; and from the monstrous and unnatural Egypt of painful and wearisome idleness, by the necessities of domestic and familiar cares and duties."* At the end of the same volume occurs a prayer (clearly written at the same period) which strikingly confirms the account of Donne's religious development that has just been given. Of what may be called his natural inclination to religion, which in his youth was not allowed to bear practical fruit, he writes: "O God, Thou hast multiplied Thy children in me, by begetting and cherishing in me reverent devotions and pious affections towards Thee, but that mine own corruption, mine own Pharaoh hath ever smothered and strangled them." And of the growth of his religious at the expense of his other feelings, during the comparative loneliness of his married life, he says: "Thou hast put me in my way towards Thy land of promise, Thy heavenly Canaan, by removing me from the Egypt of frequented and populous, glorious places, to a more solitary and desert retiredness where I may more safely feed upon both Thy Mannas, Thyself in Thy Sacrament, and that other, which is true angel's food, contemplation of Thee."†

In this meditation and this prayer Donne gives two specific pieces of interesting information: his reference to the sacraments suggests that it was since he married and began to reside outside London that he became a devout partaker of the sacraments of the Church; his phrase about the "confining" of his affections shows clearly that his passionate attachment to his wife was a real turning-point in his career. His love for Anne More did not directly lead him to change his beliefs or to change his principles, but it did lead him to marry her, and the circumstances of the

* *Essays in Divinity*, ed. 1855, p. 189.

† *Essays in Divinity*, pp. 238-9.

marriage compelled him to a way of life which (since he remained faithful to her) brought to growth in him a new crop of feelings which entirely supplanted those which had hitherto dominated his career.

That process was long and monotonous. It can best be traced in the letters—many of them written in hours of anguish, perplexity, and despair—which are almost his only literary remains belonging to this period (besides his controversial *Pseudo-Martyr* [1610], and *Biathanatos* [1608], a disquisition upon suicide). Indeed, it was a process which never came to an end. It was in continuance when he came to die. Devotion (as opposed to speculative theology) plays a greater and a greater part in his thoughts, as reflected by his correspondence, just as (according to Walton's narrative) it played an increasingly important part in his life.

Here a possible mistake must be avoided, a mistake which concerns the one change in Donne's life that has still to be discussed, the change to priest from layman. It is a mistake to suppose that this change was significant in Donne's religious development. Certainly his ordination gave a fresh impulse to the practical expression of his devotion, for he had the very highest conception of his duties as a priest; certainly he felt the relief of one who has come into port; but the sea he had escaped was not the sea of religious doubt, it was the sea of worldly difficulties, and it was energies which had previously been spent in hunting for appointments and offices, not in a search for religious truth, that were now turned to the service of the Church. A letter quoted by Jessopp (*John Donne*, 1897, p. 86) admirably expresses Donne's feelings at the time: "Touching the course [of taking Orders], I am not only of opinion that it is best, but I had long since in mine own judgment resolved upon it. . . . Believe me, I do not cast into the account of my years, these last five which I have lived, otherwise than as nights slept out, which indeed are a part of *time* . . . rather than a part of *life*. . . . God Almighty wake me! . . . I have not forgotten that in a letter of yours you asked me once, whether we should be fine gentlemen still? In English, as I took it, whether still idlers, without aims or ends? My mark is chosen, which I would be infinitely glad might also be yours."

Walton is right in saying "Now all his studies, which had been occasionally diffused, were all concentrated in divinity. Now he had a new calling, new thoughts, and a new employment for his wit and eloquence." He is wrong in suggesting that the change which took place in 1615, the year of his ordination, went deeper than that. Certainly his poems and letters, after 1615, are more ardently religious in tone than

those he wrote before—to see that, we have only to compare the *Holy Sonnets* with the *La Corona* sequence. But that is accounted for by the general tendency of his development, a development in which his ordination marks no stage; indeed, 1617, the year of his wife's death, more than any other single year, opened a new era in Donne's religious life.* To settle this point it is not necessary to show that many of his comparatively early letters, as well as his great poem *The Litany* (composed in 1608), are deeply devotional in their language and their feeling, it is enough to appeal to one or two plain facts: first that Dean Morton, for whom Donne acted as secretary in his controversy with the Roman Church in 1605-7, offered him a benefice in 1607 if he would take Orders, and in doing so said (according to Walton), "You know I have *formerly* persuaded you to waive your Court-hopes, and enter Holy Orders," which proves that Donne already, a few years after his marriage, was enough of a "reformed character" to be thought fit to take Orders; second, that, as surviving letters show,† Donne himself was ready to take Orders in 1612, but was persuaded by Rochester to turn again to hopes of secular employment. These letters correct the impression given by Walton that Donne deferred taking Orders till 1615 simply from a consciousness of his own unworthiness, and did so as the result of an inner "call." Religious and secular employments, in fact, presented themselves to him as alternatives: he was as ready for the one as for the other.

None, therefore, of the apparently signal points in Donne's religious career really marks the moment of a single great change making a sanctified out of an unregenerate character. That career was one of development—a development uniform in every respect, except in the pace at which it proceeded; as time went on it was accelerated, devotion multiplied itself, and was ever urged on by Donne's consciousness in his later years of a duty to his Church and to his flock as well as of a duty to his God. Thus his last years were, as Walton said, "a continued study" for his own and his people's spiritual welfare. This will not seem surprising, it will seem natural, to those who really understand Donne in his youth. It was in Donne's nature to follow his desires as far as they would lead him, and his obedience, at different times in his life, to two very different sorts of impulse has obscured a fundamental unity in his life.

JOHN SPARROW.

* Gosse, ii. 99, says definitely that Donne underwent "conversion" in 1617. This is overstating the case. What happened was that one more tie which bound Donne to the world around him was broken: his sonnet, "Since she whom I loved has payed her last debt, wholly on heavenly things my mind is set," states exactly the truth of the matter.

† Gosse, ii. 20-23.

DONNE THE PREACHER

AN age such as ours of disintegration and disillusion, and of conscious revolt against conventions, both moral and literary, was predisposed to find an interest in Donne, whose singularly complex and troubled mind is vividly reflected in his poems and in his life. It was natural also that the renewed interest in Donne's poetry should sooner or later extend to his prose writings, in spite of their theological content and form. If the poems belong for the most part to his earlier years, the sermons may be taken to represent his maturer and more settled mind. Nor could the poet be altogether lost in the preacher, for it is essentially the same man whose imagination will still kindle at a metaphor and whose intellect will play freshly and freely on familiar themes. There was more continuity between Jack Donne and Dr. Donne than the latter dared acknowledge except to himself. If the levities and irregularities of early manhood were wholly discarded, even as early as his marriage, at the age of twenty-eight, to Anne More, the memories of those disordered days lie at the back of his thought in the pulpit and are sometimes expressly mentioned. Preaching at St. Paul's one Easter Day within two years of his death, he is found still seeking to encourage others by the example of his own penitence and recovery: "I doubt not of mine own salvation; and in whom can I have so much occasion of doubt, as in myself? When I come to heaven, shall I be able to say to any there, Lord! how got you hither? Was any man less likely to come thither than I?" And even if long years of penitence and austerity had blotted out this score against him, it had not so completely changed his mind, but that ugly traces of it would emerge from time to time: haunting memories, with more appeal to appetite in them than he can experience without inward terror; an only too shrewd reading of the sensual man's heart; an occasional startling directness of speech which leads editors to make omissions as a concession to modern taste. If even in youthful poems there was already a provocative realism which led Donne to dwell upon the indignities and corruptions of the grave, the elderly preacher will dilate on its horrors with a morbid fascination. It is little wonder that some modern readers have turned with almost as much disgust from the *macabre* fancy of the sombre Dean of St. Paul's as from the daring licentiousness that mars some of Jack Donne's Satires. Even when full allowance has been

made for the change of standards since his day, Dr. Donne, with his uncertain sense of beauty and his incomplete mastery of his powerful imagination, is never proof against strange aberrations of taste. When, within a few weeks of his death, Donne preached before King Charles I. the sermon "called by his Majesty's household the Doctor's own Funeral Sermon," he boggled at no horror in describing the dissolution and dispersion of bodies in the grave as "miserable incest." And when he preached at Whitehall while the body of James I. awaited burial, he pictured that royal hand which had so recently held the sword of Justice as now no longer able "to nip or fillip away one of his own wormes."

Such defects, and many more which Donne partly derives from his mediæval cast of mind and partly shares with the preachers of his age, may be freely admitted, but should not deter any sensible reader from making close acquaintance with the sermons. We may take a hint about our reading, as Baron von Hügel whimsically suggests, from watching cows at pasturage: "They move along, with their great tongues drawing in just only what they can assimilate; yes—but without stopping to snort defiantly against what does not suit them." Whoever perseveres in his reading of Donne's sermons will be rewarded with finding passages of the noblest eloquence ever heard from an English pulpit and subtle trackings of the human heart into its most secret hiding-places, and above all he will be convinced of the fundamental sincerity of the man: "'Tis the very Out-goings of the soule." If the ministry was for Donne a difficult choice, and if his motives for entering it were mixed and included the solicitation of King James and expectation of favours to come, which would at last relieve him and his large family from penury, once he had made his decision he devoted all his powers to his new calling. In several of his sermons he sets forth his high conception of what that calling required of him, and especially as a preacher. He would "excuse no man's lazinesse, that would not employ his whole time upon his calling," and he is scornful of the fashionable preacher of empty rhetoric, repeating his admired successes for his own vainglory: "who having made a Pye of Plums, without meat, offers it to sale in every Market, and having made an Oration of Flowres, and Figures, and Phrases without strength, sings it over in every Pulpit." "A preacher's end is not a gathering of fame to himselfe, but a gathering of soules to God; and his way is not novelty, but edification." Donne remembers too that the quality of his hearers demands that he should give them of his best: "No man will think that we have abler Preachers than the Primitive Church had; no man

will doubt, but that we have learned and more capable auditories and congregations than theirs were." The Scriptures themselves owe something of their appeal to the beauty and propriety of their diction, and the preacher too must commend his teaching by taking the utmost pains in his preparation. "There is some degree of eloquence required in the delivery of God's Messages. There are not so eloquent Bookes in the world, as the Scriptures." Therefore a preacher should not come "to any kinde of handling of them with uncircumcized lips, as Moses speaks, or with an extemporall and irreverent, or over-lowly and vulgar language." Donne quotes the precedent of Augustine—*Non prætermitto istos numeros clausularum*—"he studied at home to make his language sweet, and harmonious, and acceptable to God's people."

When George Herbert says of the Country Parson: "His pulpit is his joy and his throne. When he preacheth, he procures attention by all possible art," he might have had in mind his intimate friend and counsellor, the Dean of St. Paul's. If Donne was at any time obliged to "pretermit" his preaching duties from ill-health or other cause, he was, as he writes to a friend during his last sickness, "always more sorry when I could not preach, than any could be, that they could not hear me. It hath been my desire (and God may be pleased to grant it me) that I might die in the Pulpit; if not that, yet that I might take my death in the Pulpit, that is, die the sooner by occasion of my former labours." He was frank enough to admit that the exercise of his gift, and the response which it awakened in his hearers, gave him such happiness as was left to him in the long years of bereavement and of waning health. "The Fathers were glad to be heard, glad to be liked, and glad to be understood too."

We shall better understand the heavy demands made upon Donne as preacher, if we briefly recount the offices which he held. In his forty-third year, on January 23, 1615—a date which we know now from a letter of his to Lord Herbert of Cherbury, printed for the first time in the Nonesuch edition of Donne's Works—he was ordained, in the following April he was made Doctor of Divinity at Cambridge by Royal mandate, and on the last day of the month he preached before the Court at Greenwich. Later in the year he was appointed a Chaplain to the King, and for the rest of his life he preached from time to time, either "in my ordinary wayting at Whitehall," or—regularly from 1622 until his last sermon shortly before his death—on the first Friday in Lent, which Izaak Walton calls "his old constant day." Apart from livings which, with the easy conscience of the day, he served by deputy, his first cure

of souls was as Reader in Divinity to the Benchers of Lincoln's Inn, an office which he held from October, 1616, to February, 1622. He was required to preach twice every Sunday during term-time. It must have needed uncommon courage to face so early in his ministry that particular auditory, many of whom would know, at least by repute, his disorderly life and irregular opinions during his student days at the Inn. He frankly confessed "the wantonnesse of my youth," and frequently cited the example of "the sober penitent Father," St. Augustine. So acceptably did he discharge his office that the Benchers recalled him to preach at the dedication of their new chapel in 1623, desired him to print the sermon, did him the unusual honour of making him a Bencher, and assigned him a chamber in the Inn.

On November 19, 1621, Donne entered upon his ministry of nearly ten years as Dean of St. Paul's. By statute he was required to preach on Christmas Day, Easter Day, and Whitsunday. He commonly preached also on Candlemas Day, and often, with a singular appropriateness for the man and the place, on the Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul. As Prebendary of Chiswick he preached, between May 8, 1625, and January 28, 1627, on all the five Psalms (lxii.-lxvi.) assigned to that prebend, "as there are five other, for every other of our thirty Prebendaries." There were also notable occasions—one of them before he became Dean—when he was appointed to preach at Paul's Cross, sometimes before the highest of the land in Church and State.

To his duties at St. Paul's Donne added from March, 1624, the cure of St. Dunstan's in the West, then a fashionable church. It may be that Donne appreciated having a more personal relationship to his hearers in this parochial charge than he could have at his cathedral church. Among his parishioners was the young tradesman, Izaak Walton, who indeed calls himself "his convert." Greatly honoured with the Dean's friendship, and summoned to his chamber when he lay dying, Walton admired him whole-heartedly. He tried to keep Sir Henry Wotton, Provost of Eton, to his promise of writing Donne's life, and when Wotton died without having accomplished it Walton, with many misgivings, attempted the task rather than that the first great folio of the Dean's sermons should appear without a prefatory memoir. Walton's guileless charitable nature did not fit him to be the ideal biographer of so enigmatic and subtle a character as Donne, but he has left the best first-hand descriptions of Donne's preaching, drawn from the life and full of significant detail. In a letter to a friend a year before his death Donne hotly resents a criticism

which has reached him that he has latterly neglected St. Dunstan's, and protests that he serves it "as often as my condition of body will admit"; there is no hint of any neglect to be found in Walton's pages. Comparatively few sermons preached at St. Dunstan's have been printed, but this fact is easily explained. It was still the general practice, and it was certainly Donne's at all times, to take notes only into the pulpit; if the sermon were to be fully committed to writing, either for the press or for circulation in manuscript among friends, that process would follow delivery. We know that Donne would take as much as eight hours to write out a sermon for the press, and he may well have reserved such exhausting labour for the sermons delivered before more critical audiences.

The remaining sermons in the large collection of 154 in three successive folios include one preached at The Hague, another at Heidelberg before the Princess Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, and some preached in noblemen's private chapels. Among the occasional sermons are the notable sermon on citizenship at the funeral of Sir William Cokayne, Alderman of London, and the sermon at Chelsea after the death of Lady Danvers, George Herbert's mother and Donne's intimate friend. It will be noted that sermons, which might take a full hour in delivery, were customary at weddings, churchings, and christenings.

"The parson exceeds not an hour in preaching," writes Herbert, and there are many references to show that this was Donne's practice, although when he came to write the sermons out for publication he must have often considerably enlarged them. In an elegy upon Donne by Mr. R. B. (Busby, the future Master of Westminster), we find one such reference:

"Mee thinkes I see him in the pulpit standing,
Not eares, or eyes, but all mens hearts commanding,
Where wee that heard him, to our selves did faine
Golden Chrysostome was alive againe;
And never were we weari'd, till we saw
His houre (and but an houre) to end did draw."

In a sermon at St. Paul's Donne takes exception to "those often periodical murmuring, and noises, which you make, when the Preacher concludeth a point; for these impertinent Interjections swallow up one quarter of his houre." R. B. also mentions that "the doctrine-men" "hum'd against him" and accounted him "a bad edifier," and we can understand why some should have taken that view. The excessive crumbling of the text, the digressions in hot pursuit of a

metaphor, the frequent citations from the Fathers and the Schoolmen, were not likely to appeal to the Puritan who wanted a plain exposition of a favourite doctrine. We, too, must sometimes wonder where he is taking us, and find ourselves to our surprise very far from where we expected to be. This is specially true of some of the Festival sermons. There is something capricious in the development of the theme, and at least one Christmas sermon has little of the associations of the day in it; a sermon by Andrewes on the same text has far more of the Christmas message. Hallam, no doubt, is unduly severe, but he was not wholly without excuse when he wrote: "His learning he seems to have perverted in order to cull every impertinence of the fathers and schoolmen, their remote analogies, their strained allegories, their technical distinctions; and to these he has added much of a similar kind from his own fanciful understanding." It may be urged, on the other hand, that the Latin quotations are short and are at once followed by a translation. Moreover, Donne often extracts golden words from St. Chrysostom and St. Bernard, and has not without profit studied the oratorical masterpieces of many ages. Augustine, Ambrose, and Tertullian are among those most often quoted, and among the Reformation doctors Calvin at least as often as Luther.

If at times Donne surrenders too completely to the magic of a word, and especially of a metaphor, his own best excuse is that the Bible language is itself richly metaphorical:

"As God hath spangled the firmament with starres, so hath he his Scriptures with names, and Metaphors, and denotations of power. Sometimes he shines out in the name of a *Sword*, and of a *Target*, and of a *Wall*, and of a *Tower*, and of a *Rocke*, and of a *Hill*; And sometimes in that glorious and manifold constellation of all together, *Dominus exercituum*, *The Lord of Hosts*."

The literary device of antithesis may be overworked, but there are felicitous examples in Donne, as in a Christmas sermon where he says:

"He found a Golgotha (where he was crucified) even in Bethlem, where he was born. For, to his tenderness then, the straws were almost as sharp as the thorns after; and the Manger as uneasy at first, as his Cross at last."

Other literary devices have passed out of fashion, for example, the incessant word-play; thus Donne plays on the double meaning of the word ordinance (ordnance): "His Ordinance of preaching batters the soule, and by that breach the Spirit enters."

Opinions have differed in every age as to the degree in which the preacher may allow himself the use of humour in the pulpit, and it may be claimed that Donne's strong and rather grim sense of humour is seldom misused. Often he will use it to good purpose. Thus he describes the state of confusion which descended upon the London business-men at the death of Elizabeth: "when every one of you in the City were running up and down like Ants with their eggs bigger than themselves, every man with his bags, to seek where to hide them safely." There is more than mere wit in such sayings as: "We call that a man's meanes, which he hath; But that is truly his meanes, what way he came by it." "The Devill is no Recusant; he will come to Church, and he will lay his snares there; *When that day comes, that the Sonnes of God present themselves before the Lord, Satan comes also among them.*" Sometimes Donne will gather up and fuse together in one great passage all his splendid irony, his vivid imagination, and his moral passion. The great commonplace of Death the Leveller, magnificently as it has been expressed by Shakespeare and Raleigh and Addison, is developed by Donne with an effectiveness which can sustain comparison with the best examples:

"It comes equally to us all, and makes us all equall when it comes. The ashes of an Oak in the Chimney, are no Epitaph of that Oak, to tell me how high or how large that was; It tels me not what flocks it sheltered while it stood, nor what men it hurt when it fell. The dust of great persons graves is speechlesse too, it sayes nothing, it distinguishes nothing: As soon the dust of a wretch whom thou wouldest not, as of a Prince whom thou couldest not look upon, will trouble thine eyes, if the winde blow it thither; and when a whirl-winde hath blowne the dust of the Church-yard into the Church, and the man sweeps out the dust of the Church into the Church-yard, who will undertake to sift those dusts again, and to pronounce, This is the Patrician, this is the noble flowre, and this the yeomanly, this the Plebeian bran. So is the death of *Jesabel* (*Jesabel* was a Queen) expressed; *They shall not say, this is Jesabel*; not only not wonder that it is, nor pity that it should be, but they shall not say, they shall not know, This is *Jesabel*."

So much for the manner of Donne's sermons: but what of the matter? Their general character is not controversial. We may indeed wish that this element had been smaller, but Donne was set in a conspicuous place, and his late accession to the Anglican ministry after being bred a Roman Catholic exposed him to suspicion. His essential tolerance is evident, but this too did not wholly commend him to that age. In self-defence, and perhaps with little heart in it, he has many a fling at the Roman Church, but he may have been as ill at ease in discharging this light artillery as we are in reading it. He

is careful to express himself at all times as a loyal Anglican, accepting the standards of faith and worship of the Church he serves. If he could never possess the untroubled happiness in the Anglican system which one like Herbert enjoyed from birth, he was yet reasonably content to serve a Church which gave him a large intellectual freedom, an ordered worship that satisfied his sense of beauty and dignity, and a commanding position of influence in the moral and religious life of the nation. Grave and reverent in his own habits, he exacted reverence in the churches he served: "*Deus stetit*, saies David, *God standeth in the Congregation*; does God stand there, and wilt thou sit? sit, and never kneele?" Above all, he is insistent upon due reverence at the time of "the holy and blessed Sacrament." Like Hooker, he avoids any definition of the mode of Christ's Presence in the Sacrament, and accounts it among the *Arcana Domus*, but he expressly claims that Christ "is otherwise present at the Sacrament, than at any other act of Divine Service."

The central doctrines of the Christian creed are treated in the Festival sermons with complete orthodoxy. In a Trinity Sunday sermon he dwells with evident delight on the "sociableness" of God within His own nature and in His relations to His creatures. But the most often recurring theme in his doctrinal preaching is the full evangelical and catholic doctrine of the Cross—sinful man's need of a Saviour and the sufficiency of Christ's sacrifice to meet man's every need in this life and beyond. Donne as preacher is preoccupied with the thought of the havoc wrought by sin, he has known it in his own life and even to the end dreads its recrudescence; there is terror as well as warning in his exposition of this constant theme. Yet, terrible and menacing as he finds the spectre of sin, there is one master-thought which brings him reassurance—"the largeness of God's mercy." His entire theology and the anchor of his faith both for himself and for those to whom he preaches is his conception of God:

"Never propose to thy self such a God, as thou wert not bound to imitate: Thou mistakest God, if thou make him to be any such thing, or make him to do any such thing, as thou in thy proportion shouldst not be, or shouldst not do."

It is here that again and again Donne joins issue with the Calvinists and their doctrine of reprobation. "Whatsoever God proposes to any, he intends to all." He bids his hearers "feare God, but so, as he is God; And God is Mercy; God is Love." Accepting as he does with others of his age the words of Scripture with an extreme literalness, he is bound to confess

that the Calvinists can cite many texts in their support, but he boldly maintains that all such texts must be so understood as not to conflict with the overruling conception of a God whose chief attribute is mercy:

"Upon what do ye ground this jealousy and suspicion in God that he should divorce you? It must be Gods whole book, and not a few misunderstood sentences out of that book, that must try thee. . . . *Ubi libellus?* What place of Scripture soever thou pretend, that place is interlined—interlined by the Spirit of God himself with conditions and limitations and provisions—'if thou return,' 'if thou repent'—and that interlining destroys the bill."

Here is the very heart of his preaching, and in that age he could hardly have rendered any more greatly needed service:

"I would ask . . . no other light to mine eyes, no other art to my understanding, no other eloquence to my tongue, than the power of apprehending for my self, and the power of deriving and conveying upon others by my Ministry, the Mercy, the early Mercy, the everlasting Mercy of yours and my God."

F. E. HUTCHINSON.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

WE are greatly indebted to Fr. A. G. Hebert, of the Society of the Sacred Mission, Kelham, for having introduced us to Professor Fridrichsen's article (which originally appeared in the *Swedish Theological Quarterly* in the Norwegian language) and for having arranged with him and Dr. Odeberg for its translation into English. The article seems to us admirably representative of the new movement in the historical criticism of the Gospels which found expression in *Mysterium Christi*—a book to which we shall hope to return. Among other contributors this month, Dr. E. W. Naylor is University Lecturer in Music at Cambridge. Mr. John Sparrow is a Fellow, and Mr. F. E. Hutchinson Chaplain, of All Souls College; and their articles on Donne, written for us in connection with his tercentenary which falls this month, throw a flood of light on one of the most striking and enigmatical personalities of the seventeenth-century Church.

Mr. H. Loewe, Reader in Rabbinic Hebrew, University of Oxford, writes to protest against the note on p. 308 of our December number, where Strack-Billerbeck is quoted as saying, "The old synagogue held very lax views on this point (conception-control)." He refers to his discussion of the illustrative passages in Dr. Montefiore's *Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings*, pp. 42, 43: "These regulations are not 'law.' They are not the *Halachah*. The women who came to Rabbi and Rab came to them in their capacity as judges. . . . The Rabbis say, 'We are powerless; your husbands have indeed acted towards you improperly, but, legally, you are in these matters in the power of your husbands, and it is impossible for us to interfere.'"

Two correspondents, Fr. Hugh Pope, O.P., and Fr. J. Levie, S.J., Editor of *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, have written to point out that in later editions of Génicot's work (e.g., 1920 and 1927) the judgment as to the confessor's right to practise "a prudent dissimulation" in certain cases has been entirely reversed, and the opinion is expressed that "the confessor cannot now practise silence. For in the present circumstances of our part of the world good faith is scarcely possible." We are not clear whether these changes were made by the learned author himself: but we knew that we were quoting from an early edition, and did not suppose that it had been allowed to stand unchanged. We are much obliged to our correspondents for information as to the exact revision made.

We have received a copy of *The Music of the Preface and Proper Prefaces*, including the Proper Preface of 1928 (Oxford University Press, 9s. 6d. net.). The printing and notation are very clear, though the size will not perhaps be convenient for all altars.

LAMBETH CONFERENCE REVIEWS

II. (e)—PEACE AND WAR

"WAR as a method of settling international disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ." These are the opening words of the section of the Lambeth Conference Reports which deals with the question of "Peace and War." Taken in their literal sense they are decisive and conclusive. They condemn all military activities absolutely, and make it impossible for a consistent Christian to participate in them or to approve of others doing so. But the writers of the Report evidently do not intend them to be interpreted thus. They make no direct attempt to mitigate the absolute character of their inhibition: they indicate no principle which under certain circumstances may justify a Christian in disregarding it. But they acknowledge that such circumstances have arisen and may again arise. "We do not deny," they say, "the right of a nation to defend itself if attacked, or to resort to force in fulfilment of international obligations." The rest of the Report starts from this acknowledgment and is concerned chiefly with the discussion of certain practical questions arising out of it. Its purpose is, we take it, to supply some measure of illuminating guidance to its readers. By the extent to which it effects this purpose its value must be appraised.

It may help us in applying this test if we begin by considering briefly how this problem of international peace presents itself to average, sober-minded, thoughtful English Churchmen and citizens—the kind of men who in the long run determine our public opinion and dictate the trend of our national and international policies. We need not fear contradiction when we say that few men of this type are of martial disposition. We are not a warlike race. War, at any rate war on a large scale, is an instrument which we are very loath to use. Peace appeals are apt to irritate us because of their irrelevancy, because the audiences to which they are addressed are already, to a dominating extent, in agreement with their main contention. The question which interests us is not the desirability of peace, but the establishment of conditions which will reduce the risk of war and gradually eliminate it altogether.

Among the expedients suggested with this purpose in view that of an agreement for the reduction of armaments has many vigorous advocates. The Report refers to it in terms of approval, and doubtless, in addition to its obvious economic advantages, such a proposal, if carried into effect, would curtail the area of warlike operations, at any rate in their initial stages. But common-sense interposes an objection which cannot be ignored. It argues with some plausibility that limitation of armaments might increase rather than diminish the likelihood of war; that the ordinary citizen would be less averse to warlike operations carried out by comparatively small bodies of professional warriors than to those in which he himself had to take his place in the fighting line.

The line of effort embodied in the League of Nations, which is also highly commended in the Report, is of more hopeful augury. The League has already achieved considerable results, and gives promise of still greater achievements in the future. But here again common-sense interposes a warning. We must not, it tells us, over-estimate the scope of this promise. The effective power of the League depends upon the

extent to which civilized nations are desirous of maintaining friendly relations with each other. Its existence goes to show that this desire is widespread. But no one whose judgment is worth considering will contend that it is anything like strong enough, or likely to be so for many years to come, to restrain the volcanic forces which lie latent in human nature, and which unforeseen circumstances may at any moment arouse into tempestuous and destructive activity. It is upon these forces that we must concentrate our chief attention. What are they and how can they be destroyed or brought under control? The solution of the peace problem depends upon the extent to which we can answer these questions in convincing terms.

Among the answers forthcoming there is one which, though not referred to directly in the Report, calls for some comment. It is accepted by a considerable number of religiously disposed persons, and is used by them as the basis of a persistent propaganda. It is that given by those who regard man's combative instinct as the chief menace to the world's peace, and would have us direct our chief efforts to its suppression. Hence come numerous proposals, some of them singularly inane and irritating, for discouraging the military spirit as it is called, and atrophying its growth. But once more common-sense intervenes. In the first place it points out that it is only among the most civilized peoples that a programme of this kind is likely to attract any considerable body of adherents. But its general acceptance by them would leave them defenceless if attacked by less cultured races, whose martial instincts were still alive and active. Predatory invasions by tribes of this type were of frequent occurrence and of momentous importance in the earlier periods of European history. The immediate menace of a similar danger may at present be of negligible proportions. But no one who takes into account the state of things which exists in the Eastern half of Europe will be disposed to deny the possibility of its recurrence in the future, perhaps the not very distant future. Then a second objection presents itself. The weapons at the disposal of man's combative instinct are numerous and various, and among them those used in military warfare are by no means the most deadly. If we are to atrophy this instinct by disuse we must take its whole armoury into account and so far as possible prevent access to it. Are we prepared to embark upon a campaign of such magnitude and complexity? And if so how are we to maintain it without the aid of the very instinct against which it is directed?

This suggests a third objection of wider range. From cradle to grave man is involved in a continuous struggle with spiritual and material foes. His combative instinct is nature's provision for meeting its exigencies. It is an essential and indispensable element in his manhood's equipment. Bereft of it he could not achieve his purposes, could not indeed maintain his existence. Like every other faculty, it can be misdirected. But rightly directed it renders indispensable service. Among the weapons it may be called upon to employ it seems difficult to stigmatize armed force as in all cases illegitimate. Embarked upon lightly, or at the behest of greed or pride or aggressive ambition, war is an inexcusable outrage. But occasions may arise, and often have risen, when conscience not only acquiesces in its incidence but acclaims it as obligatory: when it declares for war and calls upon the combative instinct to make its declaration good, bestowing encomium on those who respond to its call, regarding with disapproval those who are tardy in doing so. How can we, common-

sense asks, in times of peace decry a faculty and discourage its healthy development, which in times of stress and strain we incite to activity and eagerly summon to our aid?

Common-sense and Christianity do not always give identical judgments. St. Paul recognized this when he spoke of the "foolishness" of his preaching. Common-sense refuses to condemn man's combative instinct as the arch enemy of the world's peace. How does Christianity regard it? What judgment does the Lambeth Report, a professedly Christian document, pass upon it? If we take its opening statement as it stands there can be no doubt as to the answer which we must give to this question. If Christ by precept and example absolutely condemns war, He must include in His condemnation the warlike spirit and require His followers to discourage its development. The authors of the Report make it plain in their subsequent discussion that they do not intend the statement to be taken as it stands. But they do so by implication, not by direct challenge. They place against it no countervailing or mitigating declaration of principle moving on the same level. It is the only statement in the Report expressed in authoritative terms: in terms of the same character as those used by Christ Himself when dealing with ultimate principles and ideals. As such it can claim independent consideration, and this claim is strengthened by the knowledge that the view expressed in it can find large measure of support in the Gospel story. For there is no doubt that some of Christ's utterances recorded there, and some of His actions, favour the contention that He was a pronounced pacifist. There is no doubt moreover that many of His early followers, including some of the most distinguished of the Patristic writers, interpreted them in this sense and comported themselves accordingly. But there are countervailing considerations which have to be taken into account. Some of these are suggested by the Gospel narrative itself. Take two examples. If Christ regarded warlike operations as sinful in themselves, how came it, it may be asked, that He never warned the professional soldiers with whom He came into contact from time to time that their calling was unlawful, and detrimental to their spiritual well-being? There is no indication that His relations with them were other than cordial and sympathetic, while one of them He singled out for special commendation as a man of exceptional spiritual insight and sensibility. Then again, we have to take into account His bearing when confronted with opposition. It was by no means always one of meek submission; on the contrary, it was sometimes one of aggressive and high-handed hostility. On one occasion indeed we are told that He employed physical violence in the enforcement of His demands.

But the chief objection to this interpretation of Christ's mind is to be found in the whole trend and character of the movement inaugurated by Him. A pacifist cult, such as Bhuddism, for instance, tends to produce a pacifist type of character and civilization among those who accept its teachings or are largely influenced by them. It is impossible to describe in these terms the individuals and races who have associated themselves with Christianity, and who have regarded themselves and been regarded as distinctive and devoted Christians. They have not seldom been distinguished by their warlike qualities, and accustomed to invest military prowess and exploits with religious sanctions, and to treat them as fit objects of religious encomium and supplication. Indeed it is hardly over-

stating the case to say that Christian civilization at every stage of its development has been one of the most warlike civilizations the world has ever known: that its onflow has been the inciting cause of an almost continuous series of conflicts in which Christ's professed followers have from time to time taken their full share. How are we to explain this characteristic if the Founder of Christianity condemned all armed conflict as incompatible with His allegiance? Only one explanation seems to be available, and it is of ominous augury. It is that an unbridgeable gulf separates the Christian movement as it existed in Christ's intention from that movement as it displays itself on the stage of historical happenings: that historical Christianity in one of its most important aspects is out of line with Christ's teaching, and to that extent forfeits its claim to His sanction and approval. It requires very little consideration to convince us of the seriousness of the situation with which the acceptance of this conclusion confronts us. It is one in which the very foundations of Christian faith and practice are involved: in which many of the reasons which justify us in accepting His moral and spiritual and intellectual leadership are dangerously weakened.

A chief source of exegetical error is the tendency to draw general conclusions from incidental utterances, and to build up far-reaching theories on the foundation of isolated occurrences. This procedure is apt to be particularly misleading when applied to Christ's sayings and doings, with their frequent employment of paradox as a means of arresting attention and imparting instruction. If we are to attain to a balanced and comprehensive view of His mind with regard to any particular question, we must endeavour to rise to a higher level, and to pursue our investigations in the context of His complete plan and purpose. His *purpose* need not detain us. There can be no doubt that it includes the establishment of universal peace, of a perfect society whose members stand to each other in relationships of complete harmony and concord. Regarded from this standpoint we are justified in designating Christ Himself, and the movement which bears His name, as completely pacifist in ultimate principle and final aim.

Christ's *plan*, the main method which He employed for the accomplishment of His purpose, cannot be described so simply or succinctly. But its essential character is sufficiently clear. This is implied in His statement "The Kingdom of Heaven is within you." The beginnings of the Kingdom must be made, its foundations laid, in the inner region of personal effort and experience. Individual souls inspired by its ideals, and regulated by its laws, are the generating centres of its growth. It springs from them as a plant springs from a seed. Hence came it that Christ's chief concern was with a small number of carefully selected men, with their disciplining and training and enlightenment. When this process was sufficiently advanced He definitely commissioned them to be His agents and ambassadors, providing them with a framework of social organization, and promising them unfailing supplies of spiritual power. "As my Father sent me, so send I you. Ye are to act as light in darkness: as salt in the earth: as leaven in a lump of dough: and lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." It was thus that the Church came into being—in Christ's intention the microcosm of His Kingdom, the organized instrument of its activities, the nucleus centre from which its life would spread through the surrounding secular society and gradually permeate it with its principles and dominate it with its power.

The Church's activity has been crippled, and at times perverted, by the weakness and self-will of her members. But no unbiassed student of the history of civilization, and of its unique achievements during the last 1900 years, will be disposed to deny that these have in large measure been initiated and inspired by the Church, and rendered possible by her pervasive influence. Nor will they fail to acknowledge that the personal example shown by her members, the type of life displayed by them, has always been the most potent weapon in her armoury. "Live the life and let it work." This has always been the master precept of Christian propaganda. In the arena of man's inner life the path of obedience to it, though strenuous and exacting, is sufficiently clear. Experienced guidance is not lacking for those who would establish Christ's supremacy in their souls. So too with a Christian's dealings with His fellow Christians. By acts of self-sacrificing service, rendered when opportunity occurs, he can acquire the habits, and modes of thought and feeling, which befit a lively member of Christ's body. But he has others to take into account besides himself and his Christian brethren. He is a member of a secular society which makes extensive claims for service and allegiance. How is he to deal with these when they seem to clash with his Christian loyalties?

For answer to these crucial questions we turn to Christ's own action and attitude. Consider the social setting of His earthly career. It reeked with anomalies and injustices. His fellow-countrymen writhed under the iron rule of a foreign despotism whose laws were alien to their tastes and traditions and were not seldom administered harshly and unjustly. Their resentment expressed itself in a nationalist movement in which they invited Him to take a leading part. But He emphatically refused and sedulously secluded His disciples from all such projects. On the contrary He enjoined them to render deference to their civil rulers, though these were in many cases men of debased and brutal character: to pay the taxes which they exacted, though onerous and excessive: to obey their laws, though these included large elements of injustice: to go great lengths in conforming to social customs and conventions and institutions even when they embodied principles and sanctioned practices of dubious character. They were to render to Cæsar the things which were his: to go to the furthest point which Christian loyalty allowed in meeting his requirements. Occasions would arise, and very soon did arise, when acquiescence had to be replaced by unbending refusal. This would always be the case when Cæsar tried to invade the sanctuary of the soul's freedom and to assert his authority there. Such intrusion must at all costs be repudiated. The affairs of the inner kingdom are the concern of the individual man and God, and of them alone. But over all outer transactions Cæsar has some measure of jurisdiction. The Church cannot claim exemption from this in virtue of her divine origin and authority. Nor does her Founder's example justify her in repudiating it in all cases in which its exercise seems to involve principles incompatible with those of His discipleship.

Take an illuminating instance. Slavery was a fundamental institution of the Græco-Roman civilization. Its principle is wholly irreconcilable with Christ's teaching as to the worth of the individual soul, and its right to freedom of self-expression. But Christ and His followers seem to have ignored this discrepancy. They accepted the institution as part of the established order, and proceeded to make the

best of it. Christian masters must treat their slaves as brethren, and show them consideration and respect. Christian slaves must regard their masters likewise, and render to them willing and faithful service. Their aim was to Christianize the institution from the inside, to replace its degrading principle of enforced servitude by the Christian principle of mutual responsibility and affection. As this process effected itself the institution would in practice lose much of its asperity, and in theory would become less and less defensible. Thus the time would come when the Christian conscience would resent even its formal existence and demand its formal abolition. This, as we know, is what has actually happened, though it has taken 1800 years to bring it about.

This illustration indicates the direction in which we may look for a satisfying answer to the question with which we are concerned. For war, like slavery, was intertwined with the essential constitution of the old-world civilization. It too in principle is irreconcilable with the doctrine which Christ taught and the ideal which He unfolded. The surmise is not unreasonable that He intended His disciples to deal with it as they dealt with the analogous institution. The Gospel narrative, taken as a whole, fits in with this contention. The history of the Christian movement supports it. The Christian Church has never officially condemned war, nor denied its legitimacy, nor even its obligation under certain circumstances. But it has on the whole, though there have been many exceptions to this rule, discouraged warlike operations, and tried to foster institutions and relationships of peaceful character. It has also, with more persistency and greater success, endeavoured to mitigate the horrors of war, to check its brutalities and cruelties and rapacities, to secure from combatants some measure of respect for the claims of humanity and magnanimity and chivalrous fair dealing. We may still be a long way from the time when war between Christian nations will be a horror of the past. For this the Church must bear her share of blame. But it is untrue to say that no advance has been made in this direction. No one who compares present-day warfare with that of pre-Christian times can fail to recognize that into its texture Christian influences have passed which tend to make its incidence less cruel and its outbreak less likely. The leaven may be working slowly, but it is working and will one day achieve its complete result.

A section of the Report is devoted to the discussion of the "Causes of War." "If we are to combat the war spirit," it begins, "we must try to attack it at its source." A good start, but the sequel is disappointing. What plain people need, and what the Report, we take it, intends to supply, is such guidance as will enable them in their respective places and stations to make definite and effective contribution to the world's peace. This need will not be met by discursive references to some of the secondary causes of internecine and international unrest—to the forces of nationalism, and distrust, and economic rivalry, for instance. What they seek is some statement of principle which is inclusive and easily intelligible and of immediate utility. Christianity offers us this in terms which he who runs may read. Its analysis of causes is as simple as it is profound. "Whence come wars and fighting among you?" asks the Apostle. "Come they not hence, even of your own lusts that war in your members?" Outer warfare is the social expression of inner warfare. Men war with each other because they are at war with themselves. They will not cease to do so till they have established ordered peace in their

own souls. It is in the arena of the inner life that the battle for the world's peace must be fought and won. Its establishment will never be achieved by outer agreements and adjustments however wisely directed and deftly contrived. It will be the outcome of a process of organic growth, of the gradual leavening of human society by the forces of peace. And the generating centres from which these forces emanate and radiate are individual men and women who have made peace with God and with themselves. These are the accredited agents and ambassadors of the Lord of peace. A single man thus equipped, a single man living the life of peace and letting it work, does more to promote the cause of world peace than a thousand orators or organizers who lack this equipment. It is the primary function of the Church to provide an increasing supply of such men. Improved organization and extended opportunities for discussion may facilitate the performance of this task, but the warning must not be ignored that they may also seriously hinder it.

W. H. CARNEGIE.

V.—(c) DEACONESSES

PROBABLY few decades have witnessed more profound social change than the years that lie between the Lambeth Conference of 1920 and 1930; for the alteration that has come about in the status of women has a significance for the whole of modern life. Already in 1920 the fruits of the higher education of women were apparent, and women were entering the professions and giving evidence of their faculties and powers in law, medicine, politics, and business. Between 1920 and 1930 comradeship of men and women in the universities and in the professions proceeded apace, women showing capacity for co-operation with men and taking an increasing part in administration.

In 1927 the State set a seal to this great movement towards freedom of opportunity and service by bestowing upon its women full rights of citizenship. The political action was a spiritual symbol.

The Lambeth Conference of 1930 gave the first opportunity for the Anglican Communion to welcome this new freedom of women and to bestow its sanction upon the use of women's gifts within the ministry of the Church. Women were looking anxiously towards the Conference, asking how such opportunity would be used. Would the Conference feel the need of the Church for the woman's point of view? Would the way of fuller and more responsible service be shown? The words of the Bishops' Encyclical Letter ring out with sincerity and feeling. They express a determination to secure for women an honourable place in the service of the Church, a desire that their new-gained freedom shall receive its highest consecration. They point to a ministry in the order of Deaconess which, with an enlargement of function, should give women scope both for witness and leadership, a ministry not only in the pastoral work of the Church but in its teaching and worship. Clergy and people are bidden to welcome and to use to the full this ministry of women.

The Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference must be read by the side of those of 1920. Resolution 47 of the 1920 Conference recommended the formal and canonical restoration of the Order and its recognition throughout the Anglican Communion. To this Resolution effect was given by the Convocation of Canterbury in 1923, and of York in 1925. Resolutions 48, 49, 50 and 51 of 1920 have been re-affirmed in

Resolutions 67, 68 and 69 of the 1930 Conference. The essential parts of ordination are set out as in 1920 and are to include everywhere prayer by the Bishop and the laying on of hands, the delivery of the New Testament to the candidate, and a formula giving authority to execute the office of a deaconess in the Church of God. It is in Resolution 70, which sets out the functions of the ordained deaconess, that the most important development is found: The Conference of 1920 recommended that the following functions should be entrusted to the deaconess in addition to her ordinary duties:

- (a) To prepare candidates for Baptism and Confirmation;
- (b) To assist at the administration of Holy Baptism, and by virtue of her office to be the ministrant of that Sacrament in cases of necessity;
- (c) Under such conditions as shall from time to time be laid down by the Bishop, and with the approval of the parish priest, (1) to render assistance at the administration of the Holy Communion to sick persons; (2) to read Morning and Evening Prayer and the Litany in church, excepting such portions as are assigned to the priest only; (3) in church also to lead in prayer and, under licence of the Bishop, to instruct and exhort the congregation;
- (d) To pray with and give counsel to such women as desire help in difficulties and perplexities.

The Conference of 1930 adds these functions, "To baptize in church and to officiate at the churching of women." The use of the word "preach" in 69 (d) suggests that there shall be opportunity for women to exercise a full ministry of the Word. In these clauses we seem to find the special functions that the Deaconess Order has hitherto lacked.

The report of the sub-committee sounds the same note as the Encyclical Letter and the Resolutions. It expresses the desire that women shall bring their special contributions to meet the varied needs of the Church today. It looks for a wider ministry of women in the commissioned orders of the Church. It fixes its gaze upon a type of ministry which shall not be limited by a close correspondence with the primitive use of men and women in the diaconate or by a complete equipoise with the deacon of today. The committee of 1920 was concerned with the restoration of an ancient Apostolic Order, the committee of 1930 is occupied with its development in the future. The committee sees rightly that there can be no simple equation of the ministries of deacon and of deaconess. The deacon is serving a probation for the priesthood, but his ministry in the diaconate is limited by youth and inexperience. The deaconess at ordination is entering a lifelong service in one Order. The diaconate will be for her a way by which her life may be consecrated both in youth and full maturity.

The committee had before them a plea for the admission of women to the priesthood but felt, in view of objections on theological grounds by some of their members and on practical grounds by others, that they could give no encouragement to it. It believes, however, that in a more fully developed ministry of deaconesses there is scope for the highest aspirations of women. In view of this belief it is to be regretted that the committee was led by its desire to remove a cause of confusion between the deacon and deaconess to go back upon the recommendation of its predecessor that the New Testament should be delivered at ordination. We were glad to see that the Conference had refused to make this retro-

grade step, and that the delivery of the New Testament is still to form part of the ordination service.

There is little to criticize in the Resolutions themselves, but there are one or two points that should perhaps be noticed. Clause 68 provides that the ordination of deaconesses need not be at embertide, but does not suggest an alternative season. This should be done in order that the women to be ordained should have the prayers of the Church.

We have assumed that the Resolutions of 1930 are to be read by the side of those of 1920. At the same time we wish that the reference to the stamp of apostolic approval upon the order of deaconesses had been repeated in Clause 67. There is some danger that the apostolic authority always claimed by the order may be overlooked, or even denied. The evidence for such authority was found convincing by Bishop Lightfoot, by Bishop Collins, and by Bishop Chase, and has been set forth in a convenient form in *The Ministry of Women*.^{*} It would be a misfortune if the Order of Deaconess came to be thought of as some new thing, though its use in the present age bears the promise of a scope and development quite impossible in earlier times. Whether that promise will be fulfilled rests, under God, with the leaders of the Church, parochial authorities, and with Churchwomen themselves. There is need for courage, prophetic insight, and initiative. We earnestly hope that these may be found, and that the large band of able and devoted women who now stand a little aloof from the work of the Church may be drawn to use their gifts within its ordained ministry.

MABEL PHILLIPS (*Head Deaconess*).

^{*} See Appendix XVII., "On the Early History and Modern Revival of Deaconesses," p. 106. (*The Ministry of Women*. S.P.C.K.)

REVIEW

EUCCHARISTIC FAITH AND PRACTICE, EVANGELICAL AND CATHOLIC.

By Yngve Brilioth. Translated by A. G. Hebert, S.S.M.
S.P.C.K., 12s. 6d.

Professor Brilioth is already known to English readers through his *History of the Oxford Movement*, and it is difficult to speak too highly of his new book which Father Hebert's scholarship has made available for English readers. Here we have, within manageable compass, a really comprehensive survey of eucharistic beliefs and practices from primitive to modern times. The author's learning and remarkable gift of intellectual sympathy must command the attention of scholars and theologians, while the clearness of the arrangement and the attractive simplicity of the style, for which the translator must be given his large share of the credit, should appeal to a much wider audience, and enable the book to exercise a far-reaching influence on the thought of English-speaking Christians. The spirit in which the book has been conceived and written ensures that its influence will be wholly in the direction of mutual understanding and reconciliation. It is true, of course, that not even Professor Brilioth can make all-inclusive a survey which occupies less than 300 pages. He himself draws attention to the fact that after the first few centuries Eastern Christianity has perforce been omitted from his story. Other critics may feel that the sacramental theology of the greatest schoolmen has received something less than a due measure of appreciation, and that the absence of all reference to post-Tridentine theories in the Roman Catholic Church constitutes a serious omission. The determined efforts of such modern scholars as Cardinal Billot and Père de la Taille to give a philosophical interpretation to Catholic orthodoxy which is not open to the Protestant charge of materialism, might seem to claim attention in so comprehensive an eirenicon. But these defects, if such they can be called, are more than outweighed by the deeply interesting account of eucharistic belief and practice in the Reformed Communion of the West. Ignorance and misunderstanding on this subject are far too common in the Church of England even among those of us who ought to know better; and if Dr. Brilioth's book does not go far to remove them, at least they will be without excuse.

Perhaps his outstanding excellence as a historian of thought consists in his remarkable power of distinguishing clearly the fundamental differences between ideas and doctrines, without exaggerating the differences into irreconcilable oppositions, or omitting to notice the ways in which doctrines which are opposed in logic constantly tend in fact to pass into one another. The difficult balance between analytic and synthetic methods is admirably maintained throughout. In this task Professor Brilioth is greatly helped by a twofold classification of eucharistic ideas which determines the whole form of his work. On the one hand he distinguishes three main types of eucharistic devotion which have their origin in the New Testament, and appear in different combinations and developments all through the course of Christian history. First, there is the "Synoptic" type, which emphasizes our Lord's personal presence at the feast and looks forward to complete reunion with Him hereafter. Secondly, there is the "Pauline" type, which has much in common with the Synoptic, but interprets the common meal more expressly as a sacrament of fellowship between Christians. Thirdly, there is the "Johannine" type, which dwells especially on the supernatural gift conveyed to the individual through the consecrated elements themselves. It is this latter type which Professor Brilioth holds to be specially liable to magical perversions, and in its unbalanced form to produce those doctrines of historical Catholicism which he is constrained to reject. But he carefully guards himself from appearing to condemn the Johannine type as such, and cordially welcomes its reinterpretation in modern Anglo-Catholicism. On the other hand, Professor Brilioth employs a fivefold division of the main eucharistic values, which he distinguishes as thanksgiving, communion, commemoration, sacrifice, and mystery. His aim is to show that each element must contribute to the fulness of eucharistic worship, and that every historical system has erred more or less by the neglect of one or another.

Professor Brilioth's own views agree perhaps most nearly with that older and more moderate school of Anglo-Catholicism of which Bishop Gore is the recognized leader. He is eager that the Eucharist should be restored as the chief congregational service of Sunday, but, while he by no means condemns non-communicating attendance altogether, he deprecates the separation of the sung Eucharist or "high" Mass from the communion of the people, even when such a practice increases the numbers of communicants at other services; and he cannot approve the adoration of the Reserved Sacrament, which, he thinks, tends to upset the proper balance of eucharistic doctrine, though he is careful not to denounce it as in itself superstitious.

Perhaps, if one is to suggest a general criticism, it may be that Professor Brilioth in his zeal to preserve devotional and mystical values is a little apt to be too much afraid of intellectual definition, though he insists uncompromisingly that devotional values must be founded on objective truths. It is his dislike of exact definition which leads him to fasten on the vague and, I cannot but think, misleading term "focus" as the best term available for describing the relation of our Lord's presence to the consecrated elements. If we say that the presence is "focussed" in the elements, we ought to mean that in some sense all the different "rays," or modes of the presence, *meet* in the elements. But this is exactly what Professor Brilioth does not mean, if I understand him rightly. The balance of eucharistic doctrine, which he desires to preserve, requires that we should think of our Lord as the unseen Celebrant presenting before God the offering of His own manhood symbolized in the elements, and bestowing through them the spiritual reality and power of that offered manhood on the communicants. The elements, therefore, within the eucharistic action symbolize and convey one mode of our Lord's presence or coming to the soul; they do not "focus" every mode of the presence. And it is precisely matters like this which must be exactly stated, if we are to estimate correctly the theological justification for extra-liturgical devotions. As always, such attempts at exact statement are safeguards against misunderstanding and perversion, rather than positive expressions of a wholly mysterious truth; but they have their use.

Be that as it may, Professor Brilioth's historical studies have certainly shown us afresh that, as he says, "in the Eucharist there is both a manifoldness of diverse aspects and a central unity; just as the jewel shows endless changes of light and colour as it is regarded from different angles." The book itself is a sign and an instrument of a genuine movement towards reunion in eucharistic theology, as well as a noteworthy achievement of historical scholarship and understanding.

O. C. QUICK.

NOTICES

LUTHER AND THE REFORMATION. Vol. IV. By James Mackinnon, Ph.D., D.D. Longmans. 16s.

Anyone who has taken in hand, or even contemplated from afar, the fashioning of so massive a work as Dr. Mackinnon's *Luther* will readily congratulate him on the highly successful termination of his labours. What he set out to do has been accomplished, and he has given us a treatise which stands supreme among English works upon the great Reformer.

The present, and concluding volume deals with the last period of Luther's life, from 1530 till his death in 1546. During this period the Reformation movement in Germany was being severely tested both from without and from within. On the one hand, Charles V. had determined at last to crush the movement by force, and the division among the Protestant princes gave him his opportunity. Luther was not the man to meet such a situation; he was still, in matters political, as Dr. Mackinnon says, "an impractical doctrinaire, who could only see things from his own standpoint" (p. 3). But the famous League of Schmalkald promised some measure of security for the reformed states. A few months after Luther's death, however, its power was broken on the field of Mühlbach, and the leading princes were prisoners in the hands of Charles. None the less it served its purpose, and within six more years Maurice of Saxony, whose treachery had wrecked Protestant unity, now turned against the Emperor. He made a sudden descent on Innsbruck, and Charles only just managed to escape. Maurice is alleged to have expressed his relief; he had no cage large enough, he said, for so fine a bird.

The inner threat to the Reformation came from the extreme radical reformers, who desired to carry its principles, as they conceived them, to lengths which horrified Luther and those who thought with him. Especially dangerous were the Anabaptists, who quite unconsciously, in their desire to magnify the need of baptism on their own conditions, had fallen back into the Roman religion of works. Dr. Mackinnon admits that Luther was mistaken in his handling of this situation. If instead of being content to denounce the sectaries, and to hound on the clergy and civil authorities to persecute them, he had endeavoured to understand their point of view and to make overtures to them, there would have been good prospects of reconciling all but the most extreme.

It will be seen from the above references to Dr. Mackinnon's own criticisms of Luther that in this final volume he has retained that detachment which was a marked feature of the volumes already published. With remarkable ability he shows himself able to combine a sincere admiration and regard for his hero with a recognition of his limitations. Luther has suffered more in the past from the uninformed adulation of his admirers than from the equally uninformed attacks of his opponents. Dr. Mackinnon's treatment brings honour to himself and Luther alike.

In this last period of his life the weaknesses of Luther become more definite. The strain of the long conflict had told on his nervous energies; and, as a consequence, his powers of self-control became enfeebled. This lack of restraint showed itself in violent intolerance towards any who dared to oppose him, whether political opponents without or radical reformers within the Reformation movement. More and more he came to insist upon his own infallibility and to regard any who differed from him as perverse and unrighteous. Yet all the time his intense faith and courage never faltered; "his warrior soul" could still hurl "defiance to the devil and a world of enemies" (p. 17).

One point in Luther's attitude which Dr. Mackinnon brings out cannot fail to arouse the interest of all students and teachers of history: his increasing realization of the value of their study. "The writers of history," wrote Luther, "are the most serviceable and the best of teachers, whom one can never honour and praise enough" (*Werke*, vol. I., p. 384). It should not be forgotten that Luther spoke from real knowledge, as he had equipped himself for his great task by a deep study of the past,

and, according to the standards of historical research current in his day, was well qualified to give an opinion.

In the last three chapters of his work Dr. Mackinnon has made a very creditable attempt to sum up Luther's achievement and to assess the value of his influence. He finds the measure of the latter in the movement which he founded, which "is also the measure of the greatness of the man. He was one of those rare master spirits who create an epoch in religious history. In himself and his work he stands forth as the embodiment of the power of ideas, operating through a great personality, which creates and inspires the new order of things, compels the old order to bend and be renewed in the mould of its formative genius and its commanding will. . . . Whatever one's ecclesiastical prepossessions, whether the critic is competent or incompetent, fair or unfair, liberal or small-minded, he is a poor specimen of a man and a Christian who, in the presence of this marvellous Christian and his achievement, cannot join in the voice from heaven, 'Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours, for their works do follow them'" (p. 359 f.).

L. ELLIOTT BINNS.

THE INNER HISTORY OF THE GREAT SCHISM OF THE WEST. By G. J. Jordan, D.D., D.Litt. Williams and Norgate. 7s. 6d.

The study of history may become a mere piece of selfish antiquarianism, a thing pursued for its own sake. To relate the past to the problems of the present, however, is a way out which relieves the historical student from all suspicion of neglecting more obvious duties. Dr. Jordan's small volume is an admirable example of such a method. As his sub-title, "A Problem of Church Unity," implies, he had in mind, when dealing with the Schism of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the position of the Church in the twentieth.

It need hardly be said that Dr. Jordan brings to his task an adequate knowledge of the authorities which underly the period as well as a sound judgment of men and movements. Since the great work of Creighton there has been a good deal of research into the details of the history of the Schism and the Conciliar activities to which it led: but in the main his conclusions still stand, and Dr. Jordan's task was made the lighter for them.

This book is highly to be recommended both to students of the late Middle Ages, who will find help in seeing their period from a novel point of view, and also to those who are giving their minds to the pressing problem of reunion in our own days. To the latter Dr. Jordan's name will already be well known on account of his study of Leibnitz in the volume entitled *The Reunion of the Churches*.

L. ELLIOTT BINNS.

THE HISTORY OF THE CREEDS. By F. J. Badcock, D.D. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

There are four parts to this book, treating of the history of the creeds known as the "Apostles," "Nicene," and "Athanasian" creeds, and of the article "Communion of Saints." In the first the author rejects the view, supported by Harnack, Kattenbusch, and Burn, that the Roman

declaratory creed, in a form approximate to the "Apostles' " creed, goes back to the second century at least. He holds that there existed only a creed of five or six articles until the time of Damasus, who, becoming aware of the "isolation of Rome in the matter of religious usages," boldly expanded the declaratory creed of his Church to the length of some twelve articles. The Roman synod of 371 is suggested as the possible occasion (pp. 123-124). It is strange, then, that Ambrose, in 390, should credit the Roman Church with ever preserving the "symbolum apostolorum intermeratum," or that Rufinus, a decade later, should note with admiration the practice of public recitation of the creed by baptizands as a thing which secured the Roman Church against innovations, such as he acknowledged to have taken place at Aquileia. The present reviewer finds much that is, to say the least of it, unconvincing in this first part of the book.

In the second part it is argued that the so-called "Nicene" creed is the work of the council of Constantinople. The difficulty created by the creed in Epiphanius (*Ancoratus*, 118) is got over by saying that the text has been interpolated. This is what Schwartz suggested in 1914 (*Historische Zeitschr.*, Bd. 112, s. 242, Anmerkung 2). But Holl had the suggestion before his mind when he was working on his edition of Epiphanius, and declares against it (*Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller Epiphanius*, Bd. I., s. 146). The two MSS. on which we depend may be bad, but they are independent, and point back to a text represented by our oldest and best Epiphanius manuscript, which is good (*Texte u. Untersuch.*, 3te Reihe, Bd. 6, Heft 2). Dr. Badcock's arguments otherwise seem to be met if we suppose that Epiphanius regarded the creed which he sets forth as "Nicene and even more so."

The third part, the author says, "is largely Heinrich Brewer (*Das Athanasische Glaubensbekenntnis*) boiled down and translated." The evidence adduced is good enough to show that, in pointing to Ambrose as author of this creed, we are, in the children's phrase, "getting warm." It hardly goes further than that.

The fourth part contains definitely pleasing work. It argues, cogently and smoothly, that the original sense of *communio sanctorum* was "supernatural union of Christians through participation in the sacraments."

One of the least satisfactory things about Dr. Badcock's discussion of the history of these creeds is his unexplored assumption that we know how and to what extent declaratory creeds were used, and on what lines they came to be modified. He assumes, in short, that baptizands everywhere and from early times recited a set form of dogmatic belief. Such a practice prevailed, we know, in Rome in the fourth to fifth centuries. But we cannot assume that anything like this was general. For instance, Gregory Nyssen tells us (*Vit. Greg. Thaum.*, ix.) that the Neo-Cæsareans were, to his day, initiated with the doctrine of the very abstruse "Creed of Gregory Thaumaturgus." But it is incredible that Pontic peasants were made to repeat such a formula. Nyssen perhaps means no more than that this creed formed the measure or canon for the instruction of baptizands. The baptismal interrogation will have been much more simple, and of the public recitation of a dogmatic declaration we have no evidence at all. We have indeed so little knowledge of the general state of early catechetical practice that we are not justified in treating the spread of forms of credal expression as apart from the spread of Christian dogmatic terminology in general.

But Dr. Badcock's book repays reading, because a very wide range of learning has gone to the making of it, and it raises questions which at least lie on the way to a true solution of the problems. If it were not for its preface, one might end with praising it as a profitable reopening of important historical questions. The book, however, starts with an open letter to theological students preparing for examination on the history of the creeds. The author apparently regards his perilous arguments as the sort of thing that they should learn, and even commends the contents of four chapters as "the newest things in the book." It is unnecessary to labour the point that this is not proper *pabulum* for commencing students.

W. TELFER.

THE VERACITY AND VALUE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By James Stephenson, B.D. The Faith Press. 3s. 6d.

This book, written by a former Diocesan inspector of schools, is intended primarily for teachers and study circles. It takes into account the great advance made in recent years in Old Testament criticism, in scientific knowledge and in the study of comparative religion, and shows how all these, rightly understood, help us to realize the permanent value of the Old Testament. He begins by asking, and answering, the question What is inspiration? Inspiration, he says, may be defined in three words, Consciousness, Contact, Co-operation—consciousness of God, contact of the human spirit with God, co-operation of God and man. Chapters III. and IV. sketch the development of thought which led up to the Higher Criticism and the theory of Evolution. The next 100 pages are devoted to a discussion of the early chapters of Genesis, the Patriarchal age and the sojourn in Egypt, with a sketch of Egyptian history. This is, perhaps, the most valuable part of the book, the latter part of which deals with the history of the chosen people from the Exodus to New Testament times. The concluding chapter is "an attempt at a valuation of the history and literature of Israel." Mr. Stephenson's book gives, at small cost, a great deal of useful information.

H. W. FULFORD.